

## SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Apr. 15, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate of the calendar day Monday, April 29, be approved without reading.

Mr. BLACK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) to provide for certain State allotments under the Cotton Control Act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahay	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Steiger
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I request that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] is absent from the city with a committee of the Senate, and that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

## Senate Resolution 13

Whereas one of the important reasons for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the United States Constitution was to eliminate the unsatisfactory conditions created by persons engaged in the illegal manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas this important purpose is being defeated due to the present high Federal tax of \$5 per barrel on beer, which unduly encourages and tempts those engaged in the manufacture and sale of beer to evade this high tax; and

Whereas the amount of revenue which will be lost to the Government on account of a reduction in the amount of the said tax will be partly if not totally offset by the increased volume of beer which will be reported for taxation purposes under a lower tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That in view of existing conditions Congress is respectfully importuned to reduce the Federal tax on beer from \$5 per barrel to \$2.50 per barrel; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and to each Congressman and Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolution concerning the United States Veterans' Hospital at Newington

## Resolved by this assembly—

Whereas there exists a veterans' hospital at Newington, Conn., of 266-bed capacity; and

Whereas the need that existed 10 years ago clearly indicated the necessity for the construction of a 500-bed hospital; and

Whereas the hospital actually constructed was so planned as to make feasible its expansion to a 500-bed institution; and

Whereas this hospital serves and is so situated as to serve a wide area in southern New England; and

Whereas the demands for hospitalization in this area are constantly increasing, and the time has now arrived where hospital facilities are taxed to their utmost, which indicates a situation in the near future where they will be altogether inadequate; and

Whereas the construction of additional facilities at Newington can be had at a minimum cost per bed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Connecticut, in general assembly convened this 24th day of April 1935, do hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds for the completion of this hospital; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly attested by the secretary of state of the State of Connecticut, be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospital Construction, the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; to the Honorable AUGUSTINE LONERAGAN and the Honorable FRANCIS T. MALONEY, United States Senators from the State of Connecticut; and to the honorable Representatives of the State of Connecticut in the Congress, the Honorable WILLIAM M. CITRON, the Honorable HERMAN P. KOPPELMANN, the Honorable WILLIAM L. HIGGINS, the Honorable JAMES A. SHANLEY, the Honorable SCHUTLER MERRITT, and the Honorable J. JOSEPH SMITH.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

Concurrent resolution declaring that the Territory of Hawaii shall be made a State, and requesting and urging the Congress of the United States of America to pass an enabling act authorizing the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America and for a long period of years has demonstrated its ability to govern itself; and

Whereas the population and wealth of the Territory exceeds that of several of the States of the Union; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii contribute in income taxes to the Federal Government a larger amount than many of the States of the Union; and

Whereas the people of the Territory desire to participate in the Government of the United States freely, fully, and loyally as a sovereign State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the people of the Territory of Hawaii desire that said Territory shall become a State and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States:

That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested and urged to pass an act enabling the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States;

That the proposed enabling act hereinafter set forth being an act entitled "An act to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States", and reading as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"SECTION 1. That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, may become the State of Hawaii, as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. That all citizens of the United States who have qualifications for voters for representatives to the Territorial legislature are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory. Such delegates shall possess the qualifications of such electors; and the aforesaid convention shall

consist of 30 delegates, apportioned among the several counties within the limits of the proposed State in the same proportion as the proportion in the house of representatives of said Territory, as follows: Hawaii County, first representative district, 4 delegates; Hawaii County, second representative district, 4 delegates; Maui County, third representative district, 6 delegates; city and county of Honolulu, fourth representative district, 6 delegates; city and county of Honolulu, fifth representative district, 6 delegates; Kauai County, sixth representative district, 4 delegates; and the Governor of said Territory shall within 30 days after the approval of this act issue a proclamation ordering an election of the delegates aforesaid in said Territory to be held at a time to be designated in the proclamation within 6 months after the approval of this act, which proclamation shall be issued at least 30 days prior to the time of holding said election of delegates. The election for delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the result ascertained, and the certificate of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of said Territory regulating elections therein of members of the legislature. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegates under this act shall be entitled to vote on the ratification or rejection of the constitution, under such rules or regulations, as said convention may prescribe, not in conflict with this act.

"Sec. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the second Tuesday after their election, excluding the day of election in case such day shall be Tuesday, but they shall not receive compensation for more than 60 days of service; and, after organization, shall declare on behalf of the people of said proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State.

"The constitution shall be republican in form, and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and not to be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide, by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said State:

"First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

"Second. The State of Hawaii shall retain all the public property, vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits, now ceded, transferred, and in possession of the United States, except such as are in the possession of and used by a department of the United States, and may dispose of the same as the said State may direct.

"Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State.

"Fourth. That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

"Sec. 4. That in case a constitution and State government shall be formed in compliance with the provisions of this act, the convention forming the same shall provide by ordinance for submitting said constitution to the people of said State for its ratification or rejection at an election to be held at a date to be fixed by said convention, which shall be not more than 60 days from the date of its adjournment, at which election the qualified voters of said proposed State shall vote directly for or against the proposed constitution and for or against any provisions separately submitted. The return of said election shall be made to the secretary of Hawaii, who shall cause the same to be canvassed, and if a majority of the votes cast on that question shall be for the constitution, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii shall certify the result to the President of the United States, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon and upon separate articles or propositions, and a copy of said constitution, articles, propositions, and ordinances. And if the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form, and if all the provisions of this act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election, and thereupon the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, under and by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the original States, from and after the date of said proclamation.

"Sec. 5. That the sum of \$—, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the defraying of the expenses of the elections provided for in this act, and said convention, and for the payment of the members thereof, under the same rules and regulations and at the same rates as are now provided by law for the payment of the Territorial Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, and the disbursements of the money appropriated by this section shall be made by the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

"Sec. 6. That until the next general census, or until otherwise provided by law, said State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States, which Representative, and two Senators of the United States, together with the Governor and other officers provided for in said constitution, shall be elected on the same day of the election for the adoption of the constitution; and until said State officers are elected and qualified under the provisions of the constitution, and the State is admitted into the Union, the territorial officers shall continue to discharge the duties of the respective offices in said Territory.

"Sec. 7. The said State when admitted as aforesaid shall constitute one judicial circuit, to be known as the "District of Hawaii." The district courts for the District of Hawaii shall be held one term at Honolulu and one term at Hilo, each year. And the said district shall, for judicial purposes, until otherwise provided, be attached to the ninth judicial circuit. There shall be appointed for said district 2 district judges, 1 United States attorney, and 1 United States marshal. There shall be appointed a clerk for said district, who shall keep his office at Honolulu. The regular term of said courts shall be held at the places designated in this act, at Honolulu on the first Monday in January and at Hilo on the first Monday in March in each year, and one grand jury shall be summoned in each year in each of said district courts. The district courts for said district, and the judges thereof, respectively, shall possess the same powers and jurisdiction and perform the same duties required to be performed by the other district courts and judges of the United States, and shall be governed by the same laws and regulations. The marshal, district attorney, and clerk of the district courts of said district, and all other officers and persons performing duties in the administration of justice therein shall severally possess the powers and perform the duties lawfully required to be performed by similar officers in other districts of the United States, and shall, for the services they may perform, receive the fees and compensation now allowed by law to officers performing similar services for the United States in other districts of the United States; and that the laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii, as far as applicable, shall extend over and apply to said State until changed by the legislature thereof.

"Sec. 8. That all appeals or writs of error taken from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, to the Supreme Court of the United States, or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, previous to the final admission of such State shall be prosecuted to final determination as though this act had not been passed. And all cases in which final judgment has been rendered in such territorial appellate court in which appeals or writs of error might be had except for the admission of such State may still be sued out, taken, and prosecuted to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals under the provisions of existing laws, and there held and determined in like manner, and in either case the Supreme Court of the United States, or the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in the event of reversal shall remand the said causes to either the State supreme court or other final appellate court of said State, or the United States Circuit and district courts of said State, as the case may require; provided, that the time allowed by existing law for appeals and writs of error from appellate courts of said Territory shall not be enlarged hereby, and all appeals and writs of error not sued out from the final judgments of said courts at the time of the admission of such State shall be taken within 6 months from such time.

"Sec. 9. That all causes pending in the supreme and circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii and in the United States courts arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States, or affecting ambassadors, ministers, or consuls of the United States, or of any other country or State, or of admiralty or of maritime jurisdiction, or in which the United States may be a party, or between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants from different States; and in all cases where there is a controversy between citizens of said Territory prior to admission and citizens of different States, or between a citizen of any State and citizens or subjects of any foreign state or country, and in which cases of diversity of citizenship there shall be more than \$2,000 in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, shall be transferred to the proper United States district court for final disposition: *Provided*, That said transfer shall not be made in any case where the United States is not a party except on application of one of the parties in the court in which the cause is pending, at or before the second term of such court, after the admission of said State, supported by oath, showing that the case is one which may be so transferred, the proceedings to affect such transfer, except as to time and parties, to be the same as are now provided by law for the removal of causes from a State court to a circuit court of the United States; and in causes transferred from the appellate courts of said Territory the district court of the United States in such State shall first determine such appellate matters as the successor of and with all the power of said Territorial appellate courts, and shall thereafter proceed under its original jurisdiction of such causes. All final judgments and decrees rendered in such district courts in such transferred cases may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States or by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the same manner as is now provided by law with reference to existing United States district courts.

"Sec. 10. That all cases pending in the Supreme Court of said Territory of Hawaii not transferred to the United States district courts in said State of Hawaii shall be proceeded with, held, and determined by the supreme or other final appellate court of such State as the successor of said Territorial supreme court and appellate court, subject to the same right to review upon appeal or error to the Supreme Court of the United States now allowed from the supreme or appellate courts of a State under existing laws. Jurisdiction of all cases pending in the courts of original jurisdiction in said Territory not transferred to the United States district courts shall devolve upon and be exercised by the courts of original jurisdiction created by said State.

"Sec. 11. That the supreme court or other court of last resort of said State shall be deemed to be the successor of said Territorial appellate courts and shall take and possess any and all jurisdiction

tion as such, not herein otherwise specifically provided for, and shall receive and retain the custody of all books, dockets, records, and files not transferred to other courts, as herein provided, subject to the duty to furnish transcripts of all book entries in any specific case transferred to complete the record thereof.

"Sec. 12. That the courts of original jurisdiction of such State shall be deemed to be the successor of all courts of original jurisdiction of said Territory and as such shall take and retain custody of all records, dockets, journals, and files of such courts except in causes transferred therefrom, as herein provided; the files and papers in such transferred cases shall be transferred to the proper United States district court, together with a transcript of all book entries to complete the record in such particular case so transferred.

"Sec. 13. That all cases pending in the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii at the time said Territory becomes a State not transferred to the United States district courts in the State of Hawaii shall be proceeded with, held, and determined by the courts of said State, the successors of said circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii with the right to prosecute appeals or writs of error to the supreme court of said State, and also with the same right to prosecute appeals or writs of error from the final determination in said causes made by the Supreme Court of said State of Hawaii to the Supreme Court of the United States, as now provided by law for appeals and writs of error from the supreme court of a State to the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Sec. 14. That the constitutional convention shall by ordinance provide for the election of officers for a full State government, including members of the legislature, 2 United States Senators, and 1 Representative to Congress. Such State government shall remain in abeyance until the State shall be admitted into the Union and the election for State officers held as provided for in this act. The Governor and secretary of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representative in the manner required by law; and said Senators and Representative shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in Congress of the United States. And the officers of the State government formed in pursuance of said constitution, as provided by said constitutional convention, shall proceed to exercise all the functions of such State officers; and all laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of the admission of said State into the Union shall be in force throughout said State, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State, and the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within said State as elsewhere within the United States.

"Sec. 15. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed."

be and the same is hereby approved in form and substance as the act that the Congress of the United States of America is requested to pass: And be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide funds for making a survey to determine the feasibility of bringing water from the north coast valleys of Molokai to the southerly side of the island for use on Hawaiian Homes Commission lands

Whereas the lands set aside for the use of the Hawaiian Homes Commission are dry areas that cannot be served with any irrigation water at the present time; and

Whereas the success of homesteading on these areas is believed to be dependent upon the delivery of a sufficient amount of irrigating water to said areas; and

Whereas it is believed that a sufficient amount of irrigating water at high level is available in the valleys on the north coast of the island of Molokai: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby formally requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to provide funds for the purpose of having a survey made to determine the feasibility of bringing said north coast waters of the island of Molokai to the lands of the Hawaiian Homes Commission; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby further requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to provide funds for fully completing the project of bringing said waters from the north coast to the south side of the island of Molokai, providing the said survey shows the project to be feasible; and be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, favoring the prompt enactment of the so-called "Frazier-Lemke farm-refinance bill", which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See memorial printed in full when presented today by Mr. FLETCHER, p. 6603.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, favoring the prompt enactment of Senate bill 1220, known as the "Thomas cost-of-production bill", which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See memorial printed in full when presented today by Mr. FLETCHER, p. 6604.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, favoring the making of an appropriation to reimburse the county of Okaloosa, Fla., in the sum of \$355,241.74, expended for construction of roads and bridges within the boundary of the Choctawhatchee National Forest, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

(See memorial printed in full when presented today by Mr. FLETCHER, p. 6604.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, favoring the appropriation of funds to make the Ocklawaha River navigable from its outlet in the St. Johns River to its source in Lake Apopka, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See memorial printed in full when presented today by Mr. FLETCHER, p. 6604.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Spokane Valley (Wash.) Poultry Local praying for the enactment of House bill 5802, imposing an excise tax of 5 cents a dozen on eggs imported in the shell, 10 cents a pound on frozen eggs, and 31 cents a pound on dried eggs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Business Men's Club, of Brinsmade, N. Dak., favoring the repeal of the long-and-short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from Hon. Vicente Sotto, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention of the Philippines, enclosing a protest, signed by himself and various members of the bar and citizens of the Philippine Islands, against the appointment of Hon. C. M. Recto to the Supreme Court of the Philippines, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Columbia Lodge No. 85, of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World, of Washington, D. C., favoring the prompt enactment of the so-called "Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill", which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Newark (N. J.) Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, praying for the prompt enactment of the so-called "Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill", which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER presented the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Memorial to Congress requesting that the Congress of the United States, without further delay, pass the Frazier-Lemke farm-refinance bill, S. 212 and H. R. 2066

Whereas unless immediate relief is given, hundreds and thousands of additional farmers will lose their farms and their homes and millions more will be forced into our cities and villages and the army of the unemployed will necessarily increase to alarming proportions; and

Whereas there is no adequate way of refinancing existing agricultural indebtedness and the farmers are at the mercy of their mortgagees and creditors throughout this State and Nation; and

Whereas the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill, being S. 212 and H. R. 2066, in the Congress of the United States, provides for the liquidating and refinancing of agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest through the Farm Credit Administration and the Federal land banks; and

Whereas the Frazier-Lemke bill has the endorsement of 22 State legislatures, and in addition the lower houses of the States of New York and Delaware, and of many commercial clubs, chambers of commerce, bank organizations, and of business and professional

men and women, as well as the great majority of the farmers of this Nation; and

Whereas the enactment of this bill will have a vital effect, not only upon agriculture but upon all classes of industry; and

Whereas agriculture is the basic industry of this country, and there can be no recovery until agriculture is put upon a sound basis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of your memorialists, the members of the Florida Legislative Assembly of the State of Florida, the senate and the house concurring, that the Congress of the United States should enact the Frazier-Lemke bill without further delay; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State, to the President of the United States, and to United States Senator LYNN J. FRAZIER and Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE.

Memorial to Congress requesting that the Congress of the United States, without further delay, pass the Thomas cost-of-production bill, S. 1220

Whereas, unless immediate cost of production is guaranteed, hundreds and thousands of additional farmers will be financially unable to produce crops and millions more will be forced into our cities and villages, and the army of the unemployed will necessarily increase to alarming proportions; and

Whereas there is no adequate way of guaranteeing cost of production, the farmers are at the mercy of the markets throughout this State and Nation; and

Whereas many farm producers are selling below the cost of production with no immediate relief in sight; and

Whereas the Thomas cost-of-production bill has the endorsement of several State legislatures, commercial clubs, chambers of commerce, business organizations, and business and professional men and women, as well as the great majority of the farmers of this Nation; and

Whereas the enactment of this bill will have a vital effect upon not only agriculture but upon all classes of industry; and

Whereas agriculture is the basic industry in this country, and there can be no recovery until agriculture is put on a sound basis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of your memorialists, the members of the 1935 Legislative Assembly of the State of Florida (the senate and the house concurring) that the Congress of the United States should enact the Thomas bill without further delay; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State, to the President of the United States, and to United States Senator THOMAS, of Oklahoma.

Mr. FLETCHER also presented the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

#### House Memorial 3

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting an appropriation reimbursing the County of Okaloosa, State of Florida, the sum of \$355,241.74 expended for construction of roads and bridges within the boundary of the Choctawhatchee National Forest, reservation of the United States Government.

Whereas the county of Okaloosa was created by an act of the Legislature of Florida, 1915 session, and that the territory embraced ranges 22, 23, 24, and 25 west of Tallahassee meridian; and

Whereas it appears that at the time of the creation of said county a portion of said territory was within the boundary of the Choctawhatchee National Forest, a reservation of the United States Government, and at this time is still a portion of said reservation; and

Whereas at the time of the creation of said county there were no improved public roads traversing said forest and in order that such highways be constructed for the accommodation of the citizens and residents in said territory, the said citizens from time to time voted the issuance of bonds in the sum of \$105,000, which said moneys were expended by the county of Okaloosa, in the co-operation with the Forestry Department in the construction of roads in said territory, the principal and interest of said bonds to be paid from ad valorem taxation on the real estate in said territory; and

Whereas, during the years 1926 and 1927, it was found that said roads were inadequate for the accommodation of the territory, the board of county commissioners by petition and resolution requested the Legislature of Florida to authorize the said board to issue and sell bonds in the sum of \$600,000, the proceeds to be used in the construction of certain permanent roads in the county, a portion of said roads being within the said forest reservation; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida authorized the said board of county commissioners to issue and sell said bonds, and the said board did sell same for the sum of \$585,000, and a portion of said sum was spent for the construction of the following designated State roads in said forest, the following amounts:

\$357,277.79, State Road No. 10, from Walton County line to Santa Rosa County line;

\$71,680.89, State Road No. 54, from Crestview to Niceville;

\$26,283.06, State Road No. 105, from Yellow River to Wright, and that the principal and interest of said bonds to be paid from ad valorem taxes and other sources; and

Whereas it appears that since the issuance and sale of the bonds aforesaid that the timber on lands owned by individuals and corporations in said forest has been cut and removed from said lands thereby reducing the value of said lands to the extent the said county at this time receives practically no tax on said lands and that the said Forest Service has purchased several thousands acres of land in said territory and has bargained to purchase several thousand acres more with apparent intention to consolidate forest area, thereby causing the county of Okaloosa to be deprived of any revenue from said lands; and

Whereas it appears that due to the inability of the said county of Okaloosa to receive taxes from its said lands to meet the interest and principal payments on said bonds, and other obligations of the county, that the credit of said county has been crippled, causing embarrassment to the county and its creditors to the amount of approximately \$500,000: Therefore

Whereas in view of the fact that the sum of \$355,241.74 was expended in good faith by said county in the construction of permanent roads and bridges; and

Whereas said sum was expended for the permanent improvement of, and did improve, the said forest reservation: Therefore, be it

*Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the Senators and Representatives from the State of Florida, in the Congress of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested and urged to introduce and have passed by the Congress of the United States an appropriation reimbursing the county of Okaloosa the sum of \$355,241.74 expended for construction of roads and bridges as aforesaid in said county; be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Florida be requested to send each of the Senators and Representatives of Florida a copy of this memorial, and that he also send a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States and to the United States Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER also presented the following memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, now convened in session as the Seventy-fourth Congress of the United States of America

Whereas the navigable waters known and designated by the United States Government as the Ocklawaha River, with its outlet in the navigable water of the St. Johns River, is in fact navigable only to small craft; and

Whereas the Federal Government has expended large sums of money on said Ocklawaha River in the construction of a lock and dam and dikes, which are utterly useless without other and further work and development of said river for the purpose of making it navigable; and

Whereas the beauties of the Ocklawaha River and the inland waters of Florida connected with said Ocklawaha River are unexcelled in any part of the United States; and

Whereas said Ocklawaha River and its tributaries lie within the most productive and highly developed agricultural sections of the State of Florida; and

Whereas the expenditure of a comparatively small amount of money would make this wonderful land of lakes, rivers, tropical growth, sunshine, and wealth accessible to pleasure and commercial watercraft: Be it therefore

*Resolved by the Florida Legislature*, That the Senators and Representatives from the State of Florida in the Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested and urged to make every effort to obtain the necessary appropriation of moneys to be used for the purpose of making the said Ocklawaha River navigable from its outlet in the St. Johns River to its source in Lake Apopka; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately forwarded, under the great seal of the State of Florida, by the secretary of the State of Florida, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman of the State of Florida.

#### Senate Memorial 9

Whereas the construction of the canal between the Choctawhatchee Bay and West Bay, Fla., and the improvement of the canal between the Apalachicola River and St. Andrews Bay, Fla., are the last remaining uncompleted projects in that part of the Gulf Coastal Canal System between the Apalachicola River and Corpus Christi, Tex.; and

Whereas full and complete approval of these two projects has been given by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of Congress and the United States Army Engineers as set forth in House Documents No. 259 and No. 52 of the Seventy-second Congress; and

Whereas every Federal agency has proven the economic necessity and justification for the expenditure of the cost of these projects which has been estimated by the United States Army Engineers; and

Whereas the only present means by which Federal funds can be appropriated for the construction of these projects is from the proceeds of the recently enacted Federal security fund; and

Whereas it will be incumbent upon our Senators and Congressmen in Washington to take active and immediate steps to secure the appropriation from the Public Works Administrator and such other agency as may be set up for the distribution of the recently enacted security fund; and

Whereas the Gulf Coastal Canal System on which the Federal Government has already expended some \$80,000,000 cannot be completed or brought into full fruition until these two Florida projects are completed; and

Whereas when the same are completed they will provide a means of continuous water transportation between the upper regions of the Apalachicola River and the St. Marks River on the east, the entire Gulf coast to Corpus Christi, Tex., on the west, and through the Mississippi River to Chicago and the Great Lakes; and

Whereas this continuous water-transportation facility is of tremendous economic importance particularly to the Gulf coast and interior sections of Florida, Georgia, and Alabama; and

Whereas the expenditure at this time of the funds in this area of Florida will be of great assistance in helping to relieve the unemployment burden of the area: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Florida hereby requests the Senators and Congressmen of Florida, Georgia, and Alabama to use all possible means to secure the appropriation for the immediate construction of these projects; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Public Works Administrator in Washington, and to any other Federal agency which the President may appoint for the purpose of allocating funds to such Federal projects and to our Senators and Congressmen in Washington and to the Senators and Congressmen of Georgia and Alabama and to the press of the several respective States.

#### REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Jack Doyle, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 560) thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the 29th instant that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2035) to amend an act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing loans from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCGILL:

A bill (S. 2714) for the relief of Fred R. Cuddy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A bill (S. 2715) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

A bill (S. 2716) to provide for the establishment of a national monument and cemetery in Greenwood County, S. C., to be known as the "Star Fort National Monument and Cemetery"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BYRNES:

A bill (S. 2717) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make surveys of representative farm areas each year in each State for the purpose of obtaining and publishing information upon the economic condition of agriculture throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BAILEY:

A bill (S. 2718) for the relief of Walter D. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2719) for the relief of Capt. Guy L. Hartman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) authorizing Brig. Gen. C. E. Nathorst, Philippine Constabulary, retired, to accept

such decorations, orders, medals, or presents as have been tendered him by foreign governments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1935, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) to provide for certain State allotments under the Cotton Control Act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### INCLUSION OF PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS IN SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have received from the Secretary of the Interior a letter enclosing a proposed amendment to the social-security bill. The letter goes on to say that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are not included in the social-security bill, and, because of the argument made by the Secretary, I ask that his letter be printed in the RECORD and that the amendment which he has enclosed be referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. TYDINGS (by request) to the bill (H. R. 7260) to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a social security board, to raise revenue; and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the letter, together with the proposed amendment, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, April 24, 1935.

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,

Chairman Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed amendment to H. R. 7260, the social-security bill.

The amendment relates to titles I, IV, V, and VI, dealing with grants for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, maternal and child welfare, and public-health work. The bill in its present form provides for grants for these purposes to the States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, but not to the insular possessions. The proposed amendment would extend the definition of the term "State", where used in these titles, to include Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The need for aid of this sort in those possessions is at least as great as in the States and Territories. It is demonstrable by figures that in the case of Puerto Rico the actual need per capita is very much greater than in any State of the Union. Puerto Rico has suffered particularly from legislation designed to benefit the American people as a whole, to the cost of which Puerto Rico has contributed, but the benefits of which were not applicable to its citizens. There seems to be no just reason for discriminating against these possessions. Indeed, because of their lack of representation in Congress, it seems to me that we should be particularly solicitous that they do not suffer economically through their lesser political status.

In the original economic-security bill, H. R. 4120, Puerto Rico was included among the "States" entitled to grants under the titles corresponding to titles I, IV, and V. In the present bill, H. R. 7260, Puerto Rico has been excluded and the amounts authorized to be appropriated have been somewhat reduced. The proposed amendment would restore the amounts authorized to be appropriated in those titles in the original bill, in order to make some provision for the needs of the island possessions.

I am advised by Mr. A. J. Altmeyer, Second Assistant Secretary of Labor, on behalf of Miss Perkins, the chairman of the President's Committee on Economic Security, that "the Committee on Economic Security has never given specific consideration to the question of whether the security legislation should cover the Territories and possessions of the United States", and that he believes, therefore, that I am free to make such recommendations on this subject as I deem proper.

In view of the urgent need for aid of this sort, so essential to social security in these possessions, I strongly recommend that this amendment be given favorable consideration.

I have transmitted to Senator HARRISON, as Chairman of the Committee on Finance, a similar letter advising him of the facts

and recommending that this amendment be adopted. For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Senator HARRISON.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,  
Secretary of the Interior.

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. TYDINGS (by request) to House bill no. 7260, the social-security bill.

On page 2, line 5, to strike out "\$49,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000."

On page 19, line 23, to strike out "\$24,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000."

On page 25, line 6, to strike out "\$3,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000."

On page 30, line 13, strike out "\$2,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000."

On page 59, line 13, after "Columbia", insert a semicolon and the following: "and when used in titles I, IV, V (except section 531) and VI, the term 'State' includes, in addition, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

#### AGRICULTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR M'GILL

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a very able address upon the condition of agriculture, and the work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, delivered by Hon. GEORGE MCGILL, of Kansas, April 29, 1935, over the National Broadcasting Co. network from the Capitol Building in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the National Broadcasting Co. for the privilege of discussing over the radio some of the questions affecting the agricultural industry of the country.

During the 4 years immediately preceding the Roosevelt administration we had witnessed inaction in the affairs of our Government looking toward any policy or program calculated to be beneficial to the masses of our people. During that entire period we had witnessed the loss of foreign markets, the building of huge agricultural surpluses, the falling of commodity prices, and the paralysis of business generally. During a period of peace no such calamitous conditions without cause or reason had at any time theretofore been foisted upon our people.

Time will not permit, nor would it seem necessary for the purposes of the subject I propose to discuss on this occasion, to review the perilous conditions in which our people were living at the time the present administration came into power.

It will, I am sure, be conceded that the basic industry of this country and the one from which our wealth is largely derived is the agricultural industry; and therefore, for the brief period allotted to me on this program, I shall devote the time to questions affecting that industry as embraced in the policies which have been in vogue during this administration as well as to the pending bill to correct the economic instability resulting from some forms of farm tenancy and especially as it pertains to rural rehabilitation and which has been introduced in the Senate by my friend, Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama.

When President Roosevelt was inaugurated in March 1933, there was in storage in this country a surplus of approximately 13,000,000 bales of cotton, which is more than the normal production in this country in 1 year; there was also in storage in this country a surplus of approximately 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, as well as a surplus of virtually every other basic agricultural commodity. For these surpluses there existed no outlet or market, and the result was prices for the products of the farm had been driven down far below the cost of production and agriculture was in a state of ruin—all of which had a paralyzing effect on every other industry and vocation in this country. There could have been no degree of economic recovery without a program to rehabilitate agriculture—a program to not only restore value but a profit to the farmer in the products of the farm. Centered around this problem was one of the major issues of the campaign of 1932. It was then the contention of the supporters of the present administration that, instead of the policies of the then Federal Farm Board of buying and storing surpluses, thereby destroying market prices, there should be a voluntary cooperative allotment program, not to be engaged in wholly at the expense of the producers but at the expense of the public generally, whereby production would be caused to become in harmony with the consumptive demands. The result was the enactment by the Congress early in the history of this administration of what is known as the "Agricultural Adjustment Act."

The purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Act largely is to raise funds by a processing tax, which is in effect the farmers' tariff, with which to pay farmers a rental for land the farmers will agree to and will take out of production, and thereby enhance the prices farmers will receive for what they produce and place agriculture on a profitable basis. I would not be so vain as to contend that the entire increase, which has since occurred in the market price of farm commodities, has been due to the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, but do contend it is the one general act of Congress which has far surpassed all others as a direct and positive aid in tending toward the restoration of economic stability of the farmers of our country. Those who criticize the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the administration of it will find if they but inquire among them that the

farmers of the Nation are strongly in favor of a continuation of the program.

My home State of Kansas normally produces annually approximately one-fifth of all of the wheat produced in the entire country. In 1930, 1931, and 1932 the farmers of that State were receiving at the local markets approximately 25 cents per bushel for that commodity, which meant that the market price at Chicago was approximately during that period 40 cents per bushel. The price those farmers were receiving during that period was less than the cost of production. Today the price of wheat on the Chicago market is approximately \$1 per bushel and from 80 to 85 cents per bushel on the local markets of the principal wheat-producing States. In addition to the price increase the wheat farmers for stabilizing production to a point near the market demands have received substantial rental payments under the agricultural adjustment program for the land removed from production.

The history of other basic agricultural commodities under the agricultural-adjustment program is similar to that of wheat, and unless and until adequate foreign markets can be and are restored, this program is the only one thus far suggested whereby the farmer may expect to sustain his business on a profitable basis. As has been suggested in addition to the increase in the market price, rental or benefit payments made under the act to farmers should not fail to receive proper consideration. Examination of the Budget Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration will disclose that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, cotton farmers were paid rental or benefit payments amounting to \$139,525,359.58, and that for the period from July 1, 1934, to March 31, 1935, cotton farmers received additional payments of the same character amounting to \$85,437,179.51, a total during the entire period of \$224,962,539.09; that for the year ending June 30, 1934, the wheat farmers were paid rental or benefit payments amounting to \$68,965,433.17, and for the period from July 1, 1934, to March 31, 1935, wheat farmers received payments of the same character amounting to the sum of \$93,479,422.95, a total for the entire period of \$162,444,856.12. The corn-hog farmers were paid to March 31, 1935, the sum of \$253,536,280.21 in rental and benefit payments. For the year ending June 30, 1934, to and including March 31, 1935, tobacco farmers had received payments of the same character amounting to the sum of \$31,216,317.34, and sugar farmers had received payments of like type for the same period amounting to the sum of \$6,256,933.69. During the period to which I have referred the various classes of farmers described have received in rental or benefit payments in addition to the substantial increase in market prices for the commodities mentioned the total sum of \$678,416,926.45. During the same period the processing tax collected has amounted to the total sum of \$772,963,077. It will be observed the program has been and will be practically self-sustaining.

I strongly favor the efforts which have been made and are now being made toward creating foreign markets for our surplus agricultural commodities; but until accomplishments in that direction are more fully realized, no agricultural program thus far advanced looking to the welfare of our farmers surpasses the Agricultural Adjustment program in bringing to pass economic recovery among the tillers of the soil.

I would be remiss in my obligations as a representative of a great agricultural State if I did not on this occasion pay tribute, which I freely do, to Mr. Secretary Wallace, whom I regard as one of the greatest Secretaries of Agriculture we have had in any administration, for the sympathetic and efficient manner in which the Agricultural Adjustment Act has been administered under his administration of that high and responsible office.

At the inception of my remarks I stated that I proposed also to discuss briefly the bill which has been introduced by Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, relating to rural rehabilitation and the farm-tenancy situation. As I view this measure, it is in no way in conflict with the agricultural-adjustment program, will not materially increase the production of the commodities of the farm, will tend to increase consumption of farm commodities and promote the welfare and independence of our people and make it possible for many families to live in peace and comfort who otherwise would be without homes and oftentimes in want.

To my mind ultimate economic stability in this country is dependent not only upon a reduction of farm tenancy but also on engaging upon a program which will induce many of those in the crowded population of our cities where there is not and probably never will be sufficient employment to maintain them to move upon and cultivate farms from which they can derive sufficient in production and income to maintain themselves in comfortable if not commodious homes. Our wealth is derived from the earth, and if a larger portion of our population were living in the rural districts, our problems as a nation would be much less difficult.

Approximately 43 percent of our farmers are tenants. This is a deplorable condition. This is not a race problem—the great percentage of our farm tenants the country over are white people. Neither is farm tenancy a sectional problem—it is Nation-wide. In my home State of Kansas 42.1 percent of our farmers are tenants. In the neighboring States bordering on Kansas the number of farm tenants in point of percentage to all farmers is: Colorado, 33.9 percent; Nebraska, 47 percent; Iowa, 47.3 percent; Missouri, 33 percent; and Oklahoma, 54.3 percent. These averages are as high as any in the United States and evidence the fact that the problem is national in scope. Naturally the better, more stable, and independent farmer is the one who lives on and farms land which he owns.

By the Bankhead bill it is proposed to engage on a program which I believe will enable many more people to own their own farms. It is not proposed to take a citizen's land from the owner except where the owner for fair market value may desire to part with his title, but the program would be broad and permanent and cause a larger percent of our population to become farmers and home owners. Of necessity such a program must and, if the bill is enacted into law will be one covering a long period.

The program of rural rehabilitation as contemplated by this bill would, if it becomes a law, be carried on by a corporate agency to be established under the provisions of the measure. This agency would have power to acquire, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, farm lands and dispose of the land on a long-time plan to farmers who would occupy such farms. Preference would be given to applicants, the bill provides, with farming experience and who have dependent families. The bill further provides that no purchaser, so long as the purchase price is not paid in full, shall sell, lease, transfer, convey, or mortgage the property purchased. There is a provision in the measure which provides that this agency shall not in any manner dispose of any land acquired by it to any corporation or enter into any contract or agreement with any corporation with respect to the acquisition by it of any real property or interest therein, and shall not dispose of farm property to a person owning a farm of sufficient size and earning capacity to support the owner and family. The sole purpose of the bill is to enable persons who otherwise would not be able to do so to acquire small farms for homes where they can maintain themselves. This is the heart of the measure. With the objects and aims of the bill I am in hearty accord. The proper use of our land will always sustain us, and there is in the final analysis no other way by which we can maintain ourselves as a happy and reasonably prosperous people.

The Bankhead bill was debated on the floor of the United States Senate recently for several days when it was recommitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the purpose of perfecting some of its provisions and with instructions that the committee again report the bill to the Senate not later than the 12th day of May. Doubtless, soon thereafter, the measure will again be before the Senate for consideration. It is a measure designed and intended to promote the welfare of persons with little or no means and its supporters in the Congress should receive the encouragement of our people in the efforts they are putting forth to enact it into law.

I am not discounting the value of other programs of the administration or of vocations in life other than farming, but in the brief period allotted to me for this broadcast it has been my purpose to emphasize the importance of rural rehabilitation and the basic industry of agriculture—the industry which is the sustaining bulwark of a stable democratic form of government.

I have purposely avoided on this occasion a discussion of the proposed amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. They will receive due consideration by the legislative branch of the Government. Some of them should probably be adopted while others should, insofar as the study I have been able to give them would indicate, in my judgment should be rejected. One thing is certain; the basic program and the basic theories contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act will not and should not at this time be abandoned or changed. Without that program I seriously question whether the farmers of the country could have survived during the past 2 years.

In closing I feel it my duty to say that those who howl regimentation, fascism, socialism, sovietism, or any similar fierce-sounding term are merely for selfish or political reasons endeavoring to becloud the issue. No program is being seriously considered, and no program is or has been in operation under the present administration, justifying anyone's fear. We have as President of the United States a true follower of Jefferson, a real friend of the average citizen of this country—regardless of what may be his or her pursuit in life. The welfare of the masses of our people is paramount in the Presidential mind. Under his leadership your rights and liberties as individual American citizens will be preserved to you and your descendants. In my judgment, under the policies of this administration we are moving toward ultimate recovery and normal times much more rapidly than we had a right to anticipate. Our President has a heart which beats in unison with the welfare and interests of the masses of our people, and his untiring efforts to save and economically rehabilitate a great Nation should not, must not, and shall not fail. Let us not be deterred in our loyalty by those who are undertaking to undermine and oppose his program. Their program is only one of criticisms and lamentations. More has been accomplished under the administration of President Roosevelt in behalf of the average citizen than has been accomplished for such citizens under any administration in recent times. It was given to him to take over the affairs of government when the financial structure of the Nation had collapsed and at the most trying period of any of our Presidents in a time of peace. The easiest role for one to assume is that of a critic. A constructive program of economic rehabilitation requires constructive statesmanship. The programs of rehabilitation of the Roosevelt administration have been outstanding in their accomplishments, and not even his critics would have them abolished.

#### REGULATION OF BANKS AND BANKING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FLETCHER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio colloquy between Hon.

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER and Sherman Mittell in the broadcast, *An American Fireside*, April 28, 1935.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT

An American fireside. Our guest at an American fireside tonight is the Honorable DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, United States Senator from Florida and Chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, who will talk with Sherman Mittell, of the National Home Library Foundation. Mr. Hapgood is unable to be with us tonight but will be back again next Sunday.

Mr. Mittell has just greeted Senator FLETCHER and they are seated around the fireside.

Mr. Mittell is speaking.

Mr. MITTELL. A number of these half hours are given over to discussing the problems of democracy. Senator FLETCHER, more and more we begin to see that our national problems are tied up with correcting the errors of the past. While our frontier was open we could develop without worrying about consequences or the future. With a closed frontier and with a nation well knit, we begin to see more and more that our commercial and industrial activities affect the very foundations of our social well-being. The history of banking hasn't been any too fortunate for the American people and for some reason or other Americans have always felt, until recently, that it was a field beyond their common everyday knowledge and concern. Our last tragic experience, I believe, has opened the eyes of the people to the realization that without a sound banking system it cannot have a safe, economic, or secure social life.

Justice Brandeis has told us in that memorable book—*Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It*—which was written 20 years ago and which today is a classic in democracy, how the control of the private bankers, particularly a handful of men, constituted a strangle hold on our industrial life. This book, as you know, was written immediately after the Pujo investigation in 1913. It is the opinion of many that had his advice been taken and his warnings heeded, we should not have been thrown into the tragic situation we experienced 20 years later, affecting disastrously millions of people.

For 2 years your committee, with you as its chairman, carried on an investigation of our banking practices that has already led to banking reform. Last year Senator CUTTING introduced an excellent bill that went a step farther, but, Senator FLETCHER, what is the most important piece of legislation on your committee's calendar at this time, and can you tell us something of that?

Senator FLETCHER. In my opinion, the proposed Banking Act of 1935 is, in all probability, the most important piece of banking and monetary policy legislation with which this or any other Congress has dealt. Hearings are now being held, and within a short time the committee will attempt to perfect this piece of legislation.

In connection with this bill, I think it is of interest to note that numbers of people misunderstand its purpose. Few of them have read the bill, due probably to the pressure of personal business.

Mr. MITTELL. Senator FLETCHER, I understand that the bill is, like all Gaul, divided into three parts; title I dealing with amendments to the deposit-insurance law, the main provision of which is that of establishing the maximum insurable deposit at \$5,000.

Senator FLETCHER. That is correct.

Mr. MITTELL. And that title III carries a number of amendments to various banking provisions. I also understand that bankers, a number of bankers' associations, some economists, editors, and financial writers support these two titles. On the other hand, numbers of these people whom I have just mentioned are opposed to title II. If my statement is correct, Senator, I should think you would like to explain to us just why you think "the proposed Banking Act of 1935 is in all probability the most important piece of banking and monetary policy legislation with which this or any other Congress has dealt."

Senator FLETCHER. I base that statement upon the importance of title II alone; and it is title II of the bill which is bearing the brunt of almost all the opposition made to the entire piece of legislation.

The general public must not be misled. This legislation will serve a public purpose, and its enactment is essential to the establishment of the financial and economic security of this Nation's domestic enterprises.

Mr. MITTELL. Suppose you outline it more fully, Senator FLETCHER.

Senator FLETCHER. Title II deals almost wholly with the creation of machinery for the effective regulation of a definite monetary policy in accordance with the campaign promises of President Roosevelt. Those promises were based on the Democratic platform of 1932, which advocated "a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards" and proposed to put an end to "the indefensible expansion and contraction of credit for private profit at the expense of the public."

Moreover, it is a definite attempt to accomplish the ends which the President had in mind, when, on July 3, 1933, he stated to the American delegation to the London Economic Conference and again reaffirmed on October 22 in his address to the American people, in which he stated that:

"When we have restored the price level, we shall seek to establish and maintain a dollar which will not change its purchasing and debt-paying power during the succeeding generation. I said that

in my message to the American delegation in July and I say it now once more."

May I point out that, with one or two exceptions, title II of the bill deals with the control over the monetary policy of this Nation. Such monetary-policy operations cannot and should not be merged with purely banking operations.

Mr. MITTELL. Pardon me, Senator, may I ask that you explain a little more fully your last statement to the effect that "monetary-policy operations cannot and should not be merged with purely banking operations"?

Senator FLETCHER. Certainly. The distinction must be kept clearly in mind.

The administration of a monetary policy has to do with the contraction and expansion of the credit and currency of the country and directly affects the purchasing power of money. This function transcends those of banking, farming, manufacturing, or that of any other business activity. It literally controls the economic and social welfare of the whole Nation. Traditionally, to be sure, this function has been turned over to banks and bankers who have operated it without direct responsibility to anyone. We propose to centralize the powers and responsibilities for the total expansion and contraction of currency and credit in the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. MITTELL. Senator, what are those matters that have to do with purely banking operations?

Senator FLETCHER. Purely banking operations have to do with the direct lending of the bank's cash or credit to borrowers in which the major interests of the banker or bankers must always be concerned with the character of the borrower, security for the loan, and the uses to which the borrower is going to put the cash or credit he obtains from the bank.

A loan made by a bank is definitely an investment of the bank's cash or credit just as is the purchase of Government bonds, a mortgage, or any other type of paper representing either ownership in or obligations on a piece of property, are investments of a bank.

Such transactions as I have enumerated go to make up purely banking operations and to the extent that a banker engages in these transactions, he should be held strictly accountable for their soundness. And in order that we may be assured that bankers are conforming with the law and the rules and regulations made by the various examining agencies created by the Federal Government and the 48 State governments, bank examiners periodically examine the banks as to the soundness of their assets and the legality of their operations.

Mr. MITTELL. Senator FLETCHER, haven't we heretofore had bank examiners do the thing you are now asking should be done?

Senator FLETCHER. We have had bank examiners and expect to retain them. But bank examiners pass upon the soundness of an individual loan or investment of a bank, and finally upon the soundness of the bank as a whole. But the generative forces to which I refer are of such a nature as to affect the total volume of all loans, investments, and deposits of all banks at one and the same time, irrespective as to whether those loans, investments, and deposits are or are not sound. These forces are such as to increase that volume, or decrease that volume, irrespective of the soundness of the work done by bankers or by bank examiners.

May I stress the fact that even though bankers and bank examiners use the greatest amount of discretion in making and supervising the loans and the investment of the bank's funds, it is possible to undermine and even destroy all of their painstaking efforts by bringing about, through open-market operations, rediscount rates, and control over reserves, a contraction of the total volume of credit and currency outstanding.

Mr. MITTELL. Then you do not blame bankers as individuals for our difficulties?

Senator FLETCHER. No; of course not. There are literally thousands of bankers in this country whose heads are bowed in humiliation and shame. They are blamed for the vicious results, many of which they are not able to rationalize. They have had their lines of credit shut off, their reserves reduced, or have experienced the withdrawal of huge sums of money upon demand. In turn they have been forced to try to call in loans which they oftentimes have made with the greatest of caution and deserved confidence, to be peremptorily thrown without warning into the maelstrom of a financial panic, contraction, or depression.

Mr. MITTELL. Do you hold all bankers more or less blameless?

Senator FLETCHER. No. Among them there have been a few bankers "in the know" and also in a dominant position for laying down the rules for making money "tight" or "easy"—of literally determining the trend—yet the latter have not personally been singled out, nor can they, under our present system, be called to account for the disastrous results of their acts. It is my earnest desire that the fifteen or twenty thousand bewildered bankers, who have never known and cannot be expected to know why money is "tight" or "easy", demand that this great destabilizing and disturbing factor of monetary policy be separated from banking per se and placed in the hands of men who must and who shall be held responsible and accountable for their acts. Undoubtedly in this great Nation we can find at least five or eight men, depending upon the final provisions of the act, who know what it is all about and can be trusted to administer our monetary policy intelligently and with the greatest amount of integrity and respect for the people and to act for the public welfare.

Mr. MITTELL. Senator FLETCHER, I think I see your point, but I wonder if you can't explain to us somewhat more clearly the relative position of a banker or bankers to the expansion or contraction of the total volume of credit and currency?

Senator FLETCHER. Very well; I think that relationship should be explained very clearly.

In the first place, it should be explained that about 90 or 95 percent of our total money supply is in the form of bank credit. The remaining 5 or 10 percent is made up of legal-tender currency. For all normal business needs bank credit serves all of the functions of money. Hence, whenever bankers increase or decrease the total supply of bank credit, they are for all intents and purposes increasing or decreasing the supply of our money.

The total supply of bank credit outstanding at any particular time is expressed in terms of the total deposits of all banks. When bankers make loans they increase the total amount of bank credit outstanding by increasing the amount of their customers' deposits. Likewise, when loans are paid off or bankers call loans for payment, the total amount of bank credit is reduced.

Mr. MITTELL. Senator FLETCHER, are there any "rules of thumb", so to speak, which control the total expansion of contraction of bank credit during periods of normal business conditions?

Senator FLETCHER. In periods of normal business conditions bankers are permitted to have deposits outstanding in any amounts not to exceed the maximum permitted under either a banker's "rule of thumb" or a comparable statutory "rule of thumb." Either of these "rules of thumb", which I shall subsequently explain, afford us no ultimate protection against the overexpansion, even "inflation", of bank credit, as I shall point out. The first "rule of thumb" I wish to explain is that which the Comptroller of the Currency and bankers through long experience have been applying to the capital structure of a bank in comparison with its total outstanding deposits. It has received quite a bit of attention during the last 2 or 3 years on the part of the Comptroller in his attempt to bring the capital structure of a bank in line with its total deposits and has resulted in the sale of either the preferred stock or debentures of a bank to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where private subscription could not be had. Under this rule, bankers are permitted to have deposits outstanding not to exceed 10 times their capital, surplus and undivided profits.

Mr. MITTELL. Can you express that rule in terms of figures for us, Senator FLETCHER?

Senator FLETCHER. That means that if the total capital, surplus, and undivided profits of all banks in the country is \$5,000,000,000, then the banks of the country cannot have deposits outstanding in excess of \$50,000,000,000.

To make it more concrete, may I remind you that on June 30, 1934, the total amount of capital, surplus and undivided profits was approximately seven and a half billion dollars. That would mean that the banks would be permitted under normal business conditions to expand their deposits in an amount not to exceed \$75,000,000,000. On that date, however, the total of deposits stood at forty-six and one-half billions. If we considered only the 10-to-1 "rule of thumb", bankers would in the course of time be permitted to increase their deposits some \$30,000,000,000. However, before they reach that maximum of \$75,000,000,000 they will, of course, have to give immediate consideration to the building up of what is known as their reserves.

Mr. MITTELL. What is the evident weakness of such a 10-to-1 "rule of thumb"?

Senator FLETCHER. The weakness of the above 10-to-1 "rule of thumb" is that the limitation on the expansion of the total amount of bank credit outstanding is a fleeting fantasy, for the reason that bankers may and will increase their capital, surplus, and undivided profits solely in the interest of private profits. That power absolutely must be exercised and controlled in the public interest and not for private profit.

Under such a rule, the total of bank credit outstanding may range between two extremes where the upper limit is 10 times the variable factor of capital, surplus, and undivided profits; and the lower limit of contraction, destruction, and deflation of bank credit is an absolute zero.

Mr. MITTELL. It does not seem the 10-to-1 "rule of thumb" of the bankers and the Comptroller affords us much security.

Senator FLETCHER. That leads us to the consideration of a statutory "rule of thumb" incorporated in the Federal Reserve Act and subject to a comparable limitation from the point of view of safety, security, or protection of the public interest if the instruments, the power, and the responsibility for the administration of our monetary policy are not placed in a competent and responsible administrative body.

Mr. MITTELL. You mentioned reserves, Senator FLETCHER, and I recall there was some statutory provision in that connection. What has been the result of our experience under the statutory rule?

Senator FLETCHER. As a result of bitter experience, a fixed statutory rule has proven to be unsatisfactory. Under it in times of normal business conditions the total supply of bank credit outstanding at any particular time is determined by the volume of bank reserves and the required reserve ratio which is, roughly for all deposits, another 10-to-1 ratio; and is almost as unsatisfactory from the point of view of the public's security when left to the control of banks and bankers as has been demonstrated with the first "rule of thumb." The public's safety, security, and welfare are not adequately protected in this "rule of thumb" which is expressed in terms of an arbitrary ratio, yet variable item of "required reserves."

Mr. MITTELL. Why do you say bank reserves are a variable item, Senator FLETCHER?

Senator FLETCHER. Bank reserves are variable for the reason that they can be increased through gold imports, inflow of currency from circulation, or receipt of Federal Reserve funds. Hence the banking system as a whole will be able to increase the total volume of bank credit outstanding by approximately 10 times the amount of increased reserves. Inversely a loss of reserves has a tendency to result in a tenfold contraction of bank credit.

To make this observation more concrete, may I recall certain years of depression, when banks were suffering severe losses of deposits and reserves. The banks, in order to meet reserve deficiencies, were forced to curtail loans and investments, with the result that fully one-third of our supply of bank money was destroyed. Thus, at the very time when the rate of spending was declining, the volume of money available for spending was also being destroyed with disastrous effects on business activity, employment, and national income.

Mr. MITTELL. Senator FLETCHER, may I interrupt your discussion for the moment and ask as to how banks are situated with respect to required reserves?

Senator FLETCHER. At the present time the member banks alone hold approximately two billions of excess reserves, which would permit them to expand their deposits by approximately \$20,000,000. Nonmember banks possess additional powers for the expansion of bank credit. Even thirty billions of expansion is not the maximum, for the reason that reserves are in turn built up through the sale or rediscounting of banker-created credit obligations to the banker-owned and banker-controlled Federal Reserve banks. It is evident that this situation has the possibilities of an unsound expansion of bank credit for private profit.

Mr. MITTELL. If I understand you correctly, it is possible to have a \$30,000,000 inflation of bank credit?

Senator FLETCHER. Yes. At some time in the future they will at least have built up their deposits to a maximum of, we might say, sixty-five, seventy, or even seventy-five billions of dollars. This they can do only by literally creating credit money. Such a process of building up deposits is commonly termed "expansion of credit", and consists of the extension of loans by commercial banks to their customers by giving them credit on the books of the banks.

During a period of contraction the reverse takes place. What we have is an actual wiping out of, or the destruction of, these credits through the calling of loans and the refusal of banks to extend further credit where obligations have matured.

Mr. MITTELL. Just at that point, Senator FLETCHER, permit me to ask to what extent has the contraction or destruction of bank credit taken place since the collapse of 1929?

Senator FLETCHER. The destruction of bank credit alone amounted to over \$20,000,000,000 between October 1929 and December 1933. This paralyzed all business. The cumulative results upon our national income have been likewise disastrous. At the darkest hour of this depression we were losing in excess of \$4,000,000,000 monthly in national income. The total loss of national income during the 6 years of this depression will amount to probably \$150,000,000,000. Such an amount is in addition to the physical suffering and mental anguish of millions of our unemployed and other millions dependent upon them.

The aim is to end this sort of thing.

Mr. MITTELL. Thank you, Senator. That answers my question. Please proceed with your general discussion of the expansion and contraction of bank credit.

Senator FLETCHER. The general policy of expansion of bank credit by all banks arises during a period of what is known as "easy money", and takes place after a definite easy-money trend is established. A reversal of the trend is referred to as money being "tight" and is accompanied by a contraction of loans and a reduction in the total of bank credit outstanding. The process of establishing these trends is the very heart of what has become known as "monetary policy operations." Such operations vitally affect the economic life of the Nation. The results of these operations have had ascribed to them the colorful names of periods of prosperity, booms, crises, panics, and depressions. Much more inclusive terms have been used, however, such as "periods of expansion" and "periods of contraction."

Mr. MITTELL. What part does the individual banker play in these periods of expansion and contraction, or of creating them?

Senator FLETCHER. Individually they have almost nothing to do with the creation of the up or down trend. After the up trend is established, however, bankers may or may not follow the trend by increasing their loans and coincidentally increasing their deposits at the same time that all other banks are expanding. On the other hand, when a period of contraction sets in, every banker must, in self-defense, not only refuse to extend further loans, but more often is forced of necessity to call loans and refuse to permit the extension of the life of loans which are at the time outstanding.

Mr. MITTELL. Then, Senator, you are not condemning bankers individually, but, on the other hand, are offering a defense of them, are you not?

Senator FLETCHER. That is correct, except to the extent they have failed to recognize the facts which I am now pointing out. It would seem that the American Bankers' Association and their connections might have—as a result of a thorough analysis of the facts—ameliorated, if not prevented, the paralyzing contraction of bank credit so disastrous to this Nation.

Mr. MITTELL. Who, then, is responsible; and at what forces is this bill directed?

Senator FLETCHER. Title II of the bill does not deal with banks or bankers individually. It deals with banking operations as a whole only to the extent of centralizing the responsibility for the

exercise of the powers which control the establishment of these trends. The individual operations—such as lending, investing, etc.—of commercial banks are not contained in the subject matter of title II. However, the power to create or destroy the reserves of commercial banks, to raise or lower the rediscount rate, and other operations incidental to the effective regulation and control over the monetary policy of this Nation, constitute the sole subject matter of this portion of the bill.

The power to determine the trend is at the present time committed without definite responsibility to the Federal open market committee, the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the Federal Reserve Board. They are unwilling, however, to assume the responsibilities for the disastrous results which have prostrated the Nation. Moreover, no adequate penalties can be ascribed. It is futile to attempt to continue under the present set-up. In conformity with that provision of the Constitution which declares the "Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin", we propose to perform our legislative duty through the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MITTELL. Well said Senator. I am beginning to understand why you attach such vast importance to the bill.

Senator FLETCHER. The power to initiate open-market operations is now in the hands of the committee which consists of governors of the Federal Reserve banks. The Reserve banks individually, however, may or may not choose to cooperate. The choice depends upon the purely private interests and private profit motives of these banks. Public interest must not be compromised for private profits.

Mr. MITTELL. Well, what do you intend to do to protect the public's interest?

Senator FLETCHER. We propose to revert approximately to the original purpose of the Federal Reserve Act in which the executive head of the Reserve banks was designated as an agent of the Federal Reserve Board. Moreover, we shall both in spirit and in fact conform with the original provision of section 11 of that act, which states "The Federal Reserve Board shall be authorized and empowered. . . (subsection j) to exercise general supervision over said Federal Reserve banks."

Mr. MITTELL. What effect will that have upon the regional operations of a Federal Reserve bank?

Senator FLETCHER. We are not destroying the purely regional banking operations of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. We are only restoring to the Federal Reserve Board powers which have been wrested from the Board by the governors of the Federal Reserve banks. Bankers, per se, will not be deprived of a single purely banking function. At the same time we expect to give to them that security which is absolutely essential to the protection of the economic and social life of this Nation.

Political control over the System is not our object, nor is it the issue. Again I say, "Do not be misled." The people of this Nation, through the Congress, are determined to "nail down" and fix the responsibility for the expansion and contraction of our credit and currency and concentrate those powers in the hands of men who must "do the job."

Mr. MITTELL. Thank you, Senator FLETCHER. I think your remarks tonight were of great educational importance to our people. It is my feeling that the public will support your efforts at banking reform if they receive adequate information.

Our problem today is to bring enlightenment on those social and economic questions that press for a solution and about which there are no adequate texts accessible to the millions. To meet this need we recently brought out inexpensive reprints of that great classic in democracy, *Other People's Money*, by Justice Brandeis, and have recently issued a new book, *Money and Its Power*, by Winslow and Brougham, which explains simply and comprehensively the questions and problems related to money, its uses, and power.

Senator FLETCHER. I have read both books. The first, of course, is a classic, and should be in every home. But *Money and Its Power* I found particularly appropriate at this time. It is an excellent condensed discussion of the uses, characteristics, standards, inflation, foreign exchange, and related subjects. It contains much valuable information, well arranged, and expressed. I have recommended it to friends who are studying banking, currency, and monetary policy.

It is a very helpful and useful book.

Mr. MITTELL. Your comments make me very proud in view of the fact that we included a book entitled "Money and Its Power" in the National Home Library series. Hon. Robert L. Owen sent copies of the book to all Members of the Senate and Congress, and many of the replies he received would indicate that it has been of service.

Have you read the book *Money and Its Power*; and if so, what would you say about it?

Senator FLETCHER. Yes; I have read it carefully, most of it more than once. It is a very excellent, condensed discussion of money, its use and characteristics, standards, inflation, foreign exchange, and related subjects. It contains much valuable information, well arranged and expressed. I have recommended it to friends who are studying banking, currency, and monetary policy.

It is a very helpful and useful book.

#### PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. COSTIGAN that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] had the floor when the Senate took a recess yesterday afternoon, and the Chair thinks he should recognize the Senator from South Carolina to continue his address. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not desire to consume any further time of the Senate on the particular motion which is pending, and, therefore, I yield the floor.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, an impressive telegram has reached me, which, unless there shall be objection, I should like to have read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1935.

HON. EDWARD P. COSTIGAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Writers League Against Lynching, composed of writers, editors, and publishers throughout the Nation, urges strongly your resistance to filibuster against Costigan-Wagner bill. Needless to say, we are for the passage of that bill 100 percent.

The Writers League Against Lynching; Lewis S. Gannett, president; Suzanne La Follette, secretary; members: Louis Adamic, Gertrude Atherton, Faith Baldwin, Mary R. Beard, Robert Benchley, Stephen Vincent Benet, Bruce Bliven, Herschel Brickell, Vanwyck Brooks, Struthers Burt, Erskine Caldwell, Henry S. Canby, Marc Connelly, Countee Cullen, Babette Deutsch, James H. Dillar, Edward Donahoe, Theodore Dreiser, Abraham Epstein, Edna Ferber, Arthur Davison Ficke, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, E. Franklin Frazier, C. Hartley Grattan, Harold K. Guinzburg, Louis M. Hacker, Harry Hansen, Jessie Fauset Harris, Robert Herrick, Sheila Hibben, B. W. Huebsch, Inez Haynes Irwin, Georgia Douglas Johnson, James Weldon Johnson, Freda Kirchwey, Alfred A. Knopf, Joseph Wood Krutch, William Ellery Leonard, Sinclair Lewis, Alain Locke, Leonore Marshall, Annie Nathan Meyer, George Milburn, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Ruth Comfort Mitchell, Lewis Mumford, George Jean Nathan, Robert Nathan, W. W. Norton, Mary White Ovington, William Pickens, Ruth Pickering, A. S. Platt, Lorine Pruette, Elmer Rice, Lola Ridge, Gerold Tanquary Robinson, John William Rogers, Charles Edward Russell, George S. Schuyler, Evelyn Scott, Upton Sinclair, George Soule, Benjamin Stolberg, Phil Strong, Ruth Suckow, Carl Vandoren, Dorothy Vandoren, Mark Vandoren, Carl Van Vechten.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, for some time I have desired to make a statement on the subject of the authorship of the subsistence homestead law. I have not been willing, however, while the Senate had any serious business before it, to divert the attention of the Senate and take its time so long as we were moving along line of enacting legislation looking to the welfare of all the people of the country. I believe, therefore, before proceeding to discuss the pending motion, it would be appropriate to make the statement which I have heretofore desired to make.

It is possible that some of my colleagues in the Senate who have noticed my very great interest in agricultural legislation and my activities along that line may be laboring under the impression that I have not given serious attention to the unfortunate plight of many people in our industrial centers.

When I was elected to the Senate the depression had been under way for about a year. I had devoted my life to the practice of law, not to farming. I had been in large measure a corporation lawyer in the industrial section of my State and had been an industrialist, having opened and developed one of the very largest commercial mines in the State of Alabama. However, when many of us began to give serious consideration to the effort to diagnose the cause of the great depression and, if possible, to find a remedy for it, I made the best economic survey of which I was capable. It did not take me very long to arrive at the conclusion that it was necessary, in any fundamental program of recovery, to begin with agriculture. We found, day after day during that period, industries all over America either greatly reducing their operating time or closing down their plants. Why was that? They were not pursuing that course as a matter of convenience. They were forced to it because the consuming and buying power of their former customers

had been so greatly decreased that operations in industry could not proceed on the former levels.

As industrial employees were removed from the pay rolls, in that same proportion the buying and consuming demand for industrial commodities was decreased. When we looked out across the vast expanse of this great country and viewed 30,000,000 people upon the farms of the United States, who had been applying their entire purchasing power to the continued operation of the industrial plants of the country, and found that their purchasing power had almost disappeared, when we took into consideration the fact that in addition to these 30,000,000 consumers upon the farms of America there was an equal if not larger number in the towns and cities of the country in the great agricultural areas who were dependent for their income and their support upon the purchasing power of the farmers in their trade areas, we quickly realized that approximately one-half, if not more, of the population of the entire country had lost their former purchasing power or that it had been so greatly reduced that the markets which industry had formerly enjoyed were disappearing or had in fact disappeared.

When we heard the complaint, the just complaint, about the loss of our foreign markets resulting from the nefarious tariff doctrine of the Republican Party, resulting from the Fordney-McCumber bill and the Smoot-Hawley bill, which precipitated a trade war with all the nations of the world and caused them to retaliate by raising their tariff rates, we regretted that some small proportion of the commodities of the industrial plants of this country had lost their markets.

But here at the very doors of the manufacturing institutions of the country was the farmer consuming public, consisting of approximately if not more than one-half of the American people who had lost their ability to buy the products of industry. Then it became perfectly clear that we could have no real substantial recovery in this country, that we could bring no relief to the millions of industrial employees, many of them concentrated upon the farms in industrial sections of America, unless we brought about some measure of rural rehabilitation.

Mr. President, my first thought upon the subject was to try to give relief to as large a number as practicable of those who had left the farms and gone into the industrial centers, lured there by the high tide of mass consumption, by the high wages being paid by industry, by the bright lights of the city, by the pleasures and comforts which the city people enjoy and of which the rural people are deprived. With that influx of people from the rural sections into the cities, we found an overbalanced population in the cities and the industrial sections.

When our financial troubles developed, when millions of employees were released from the pay rolls, something had to be done. We had an administration in power at that time which stubbornly resisted, as some of those who were here during that period stubbornly resisted, any direct Federal relief for the suffering and starving millions in the industrial sections who had lost their earning power and their employment. It is well known here that the doctrine was announced by the former President that he was willing to feed the cattle of the country but not to feed the human souls. So we had that distressing situation.

It seemed to me that the time and conditions required some effort in some way to aid many of the people who had no immediate prospect of reemployment in industry to get back to a little patch of ground somewhere in the country; so under Mr. Hoover's administration I began the program for the relief to that extent of the unemployed in the industrial sections of the country. In view of the way the subsistence homestead law was finally put upon the statute books, and the uncertainty regarding that measure and the unfamiliarity with it, I have decided to make a statement about its authorship and to give a brief history of the steps which were taken progressively to bring about that kind of relief to the distressed unemployed workmen in the industrial centers, and especially those who had previous farming experience.

In view of the fact that the subsistence homestead law was incorporated as an amendment to the National Industrial Recovery Act while that measure was pending before the Senate Finance Committee, there has been much uncertainty about the authorship of the amendment. For the benefit of those who are interested in the subject, I have decided that it would be well to let the RECORD show the facts.

I am the author of section 208 of the Industrial Recovery Act, the subsistence homestead law. In 1932 I made an effort in the Senate to secure the enactment of legislation having for its purpose Federal aid in the back-to-the-land movement. While the bill was pending enlarging the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and making additional sums available to it, I offered the following amendment:

All or any part of such grants may be disbursed in aid or furtherance of any program or programs of unemployment relief based on the location of those deemed entitled to relief on farm lands, either in such State or elsewhere, and either by direct expenditure or by loans to any approved agency or to groups or individuals.

On June 10, 1932, under Mr. Hoover's administration, I addressed the Senate in support of that amendment. My address will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 12531. I beg to quote extracts from that speech:

The plan proposed involves a reappraisal of social and economic conditions, and also planning for permanent relief for a large number of families who are now in the destitute class. I pretend no originality in conception of the suggested program. It has had wide consideration by students whose minds have tried to rebuild an enduring social and economic structure and who entertain no satisfactory reassurance that temporary aid for the unemployed will permanently solve the most important of all the problems confronting our country.

Food and shelter for all who are willing to work and for all who cannot secure gainful employment is the paramount slogan in the heart of every true American. I have no formula for a full and complete solution of our ills. The back-to-the-soil plan is tendered as a partial solution only, but one under which the credit extended will pro tanto permanently solve the problem of present peril for many people.

It is evident that our social and economic life is now in the process of readjustment. The machinery and gasoline age and the World War brought about a general shift in the affairs of men.

In former days there existed a balance between the number engaged in agriculture and industry. The necessities of the World War, followed by a period of excessive inflation, brought the era of mass production. A great draft of farmers and their sons to industry followed.

Inventive genius produced new machinery to displace man power. Production was thereby increased and gross earnings of the working class correspondingly decreased. Then came the crash of 1929, since which time the wheels of industry have constantly slowed down. The number of workers unemployed has constantly increased. With millions now unemployed and their accumulations exhausted, everyone is asking: "What can be done?" "When will business improve so that the unemployed can have work?"

It is likely that it will be too long to wait for a sufficient revival of business to engage all the men drawn into industry during the last decade. For some years we have had a degree of production and business activity never before witnessed. Can we reasonably expect an early return of such conditions and the early reemployment by industry of the great army of the unemployed? It takes great optimism to generate much confidence in such a happy result. Some people seem to think that it is the duty of the Government to provide employment for all who want to work. Without entering into a discussion of the principles of government involved, the suggestion may be disposed of now with the statement that under prevailing conditions it is impossible to carry out the suggestion. While it may not be the duty of the American Government to furnish employment, it has a direct responsibility for legislation and actions which result directly or indirectly in unemployment. As I am considering remedies for our unhappy plight, I shall not give expression to my views on unwise legislation during recent years which may be responsible for prevailing conditions.

Everyone with a normal heart is grieved when he witnesses distress being suffered by his fellow men. Generosity in helping the needy by those who have a surplus beyond their actual requirements stirs us with emotions higher than mere admiration. Much of that sort of helpfulness is now necessary, but, in my opinion, such aid hereafter will be entirely inadequate to care for the destitute.

This speech was made in 1932.

A large public-works program will, of course, be helpful. It is doubtful if such a plan, however, can be financed on a scale commensurate with the requirements of the unemployed in all sections of the country. Such public works must of necessity be carried on in selected spots. Additional employment will be provided in the fortunate localities. That will be helpful; but when the work shall be finished, what then will be the situation?

Those furnished employment will again find themselves unemployed, and the program may not be repeated indefinitely. It seems to me that it would be wiser to devote some part of the available credit of the Government to some plan which looks to permanent rather than temporary relief if such a recourse may be found.

How many years lie ahead of us before industry can again employ all the idle workers? What is to be done before that time comes if it arrives during the present generation? Can a more evenly balanced coordination between the number engaged in industry and agriculture be reestablished? Can society be readjusted to normal conditions which prevailed before the orgy of industrial production held out false hope of permanent employment to so many who were otherwise employed and to so many farmers and sons of farmers?

When America was establishing itself on the firm basis of growth which brought it to the forefront of nations there were few industrial workers. An overwhelming proportion of our population tilled the soil or engaged in business directly related to agriculture. It can be done again. It seems inevitable that many who were raised upon the farm must return to the soil. If employment cannot be found in the cities and towns, a living can be dug out of the earth. Unfortunately for many people, prevailing conditions do not present a free choice of occupations. Dire necessity decrees for many, for a time at least, that any honorable work, urban or rural, should be accepted that will keep the family together and the wolf from the door until something more suitable can be found.

A picture of the shift from rural to urban population may be had by reviewing the census reports on rural and urban population. The last four census reports showed the percentage of rural population as follows:

	Percent
1900.....	60.0
1910.....	54.2
1920.....	48.6
1930.....	43.8

Towns with less than 2,500 population are counted as rural. Using 123,000,000 as the total population for 1930, it appears that if the same ratio had been maintained between rural and urban population, there are now in the cities 6,000,000 people who, under the 1920 ratio, would be in the rural classification. Based on the ratio of 1910, there are 12,500,000 people who would now be in the rural classification. Based on the ratio of 1900, there are 19,700,000 people now in the cities who would have been in the country. These figures present a startling shift from rural to city life. The census reports for 1920 and 1930 separate the rural population into rural farm and rural nonfarm population, thereby separating the population in the small towns and in the country not engaged in farming. In 1920 the rural farm population was 29.7 percent of the total. In 1930 it was 24.6 percent. It is significant that lacking only one-tenth of 1 percent the entire shift to urban from rural population from 1920 to 1930 was from the rural farm population, numbering 6,000,000 people, according to the ratios, if they had been maintained.

Mr. President, it may be suggested that there is now an overproduction of farm commodities. With staple cash products, such as cotton and wheat, that may be true from the standpoint of the ability of consumers to buy. The farmers' trouble is not the absence of home necessities. He has food and feeds in abundance. His problem is keeping the sheriff from his door because of debts incurred when 1 bale of cotton would pay as much on his debt as 4 bales will now pay, or 1 bushel of wheat would buy as much as 4 bushels will now buy.

Fortunately, of course, since the date when this speech was delivered the condition of the farmers has been very greatly improved. Prices are much better than those which prevailed at that time.

I continue reading from the speech:

If the average farmer could forget his old debts, he would not be prosperous but he would not be destitute.

The question arises, How can the unemployed go to the farm when he has no farm, no work stock or implements, no food and no feed?

If 1,000,000 men now unemployed could be financed under a back-to-the-soil program, an improvement in business conditions would more quickly afford work for others unemployed, and would remove several million people from the ranks of the very large number who are anxiously thinking of food for tomorrow.

Farm leaders for years have urged the establishment of a large fund to buy surplus commodities out of the market. For more logical and stronger economic and humane reasons a large fund to lift the surplus of unemployed workers out of the industrial market and from the domain of benevolence can be sustained.

If a fund of \$1,000,000,000 should be applied to aiding unemployed who desire to return to the farm or to a subsistence home, it could probably be so used as to place 1,000,000 or more men with their families on productive land. It should not be forgotten that there are millions of acres of improved farm lands which under present conditions can be rented at small costs. With the acreage-reduction program under full swing, there will be more millions of acres of improved lands which could be rented. Work stock, farming tools, and supplies are cheaper than they have been for years. Many farms can be bought for a very small initial payment. Land can be bought for little more than current taxes.

Would this addition to the 11,000,000 men now engaged in agriculture aggravate their present plight? It will not if farmers become convinced that their main business should be producing a living at home and some cash commodity as a side line. They were in much better condition when a larger proportion of our population was rural.

The money furnished should not be a gift; it should be a loan with installment payments over a reasonable time, and secured by continuing liens on crops and stock and land. The difficulties of private capital doing the financing are recognized. Profits would be limited to interest, and there would be losses of invested capital. The attractions of industry lured countless thousands from the farms. The lure not being sustained, industry should support a program to help get them back to the farm. A large movement from congested urban centers to the vast spaces of rural opportunity would to that extent aid in readjusting an economic unbalance between workers and jobs in industry. Under this plan, decentralization would be and should be accelerated.

It should not be forgotten that rural life has in recent years been vastly changed. With good roads, rural mail delivery, improved school facilities, consolidated schools with free bus service, free transportation to high schools, rural telephones, and many other advantages, country life from a social standpoint is in large measure comparable to suburban opportunities.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I am sure Senators ought to hear the address now being delivered by the able and eloquent Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahay	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I shall continue to read from the speech I made on June 10, 1932, on the subject of relief for the unemployed in the industrial centers:

A large back-to-the-farm revolving loan fund would be a source of relief to worthy, good citizens, farmers by training, who are anxious to engage in any honorable work that will preserve their home circle and provide a way for them to embark upon an enterprise which may be temporary or permanent according to the unfolding of the future for each individual.

If it may be a long time before all who have been engaged in industrial work can get work again in industry—white collars and overalls—why not bridge over the chasm, and help those who desire to do so to establish themselves in self-supporting work?

The immediate helpful effect of the expenditure of such a sum of money, distributed largely among farmers in the purchase of farming outfits, is a consideration not to be ignored.

To buy a million cows, a million mules and horses, a million sows and millions of pigs, a million broods of chickens, millions of bushels of corn and hay and potatoes, and all the other things necessary to establish a family on a farm, would put most of the money in circulation where it is sorely needed, and provide present farmers who sell to the new farmers additional debt-paying power. A new market would thus be provided where there is now no market. Farm prices would be stimulated, and land values made firmer. In the construction of many small homes the building trade would greatly benefit, and work would be afforded for many now unemployed.

The suggestion of aiding former ruralists to get back to the soil does not involve the idea of placing all of them in the business of farming, nor of the acquisition in all cases of large acreage. For those who now live in large industrial centers, and who prefer to remain in close proximity to openings for industrial employment, a few acres of land with a very modest home would serve the purpose. The principal object is to provide a place where with thrift, frugality, and industry they can work out from the soil a subsistence for themselves and their families,

and as a side line find employment here and there, now and then, until a better day dawns.

Those who conceive that few would, in good faith, take advantage of a back-to-the-soil movement must not know the heartburns of millions now drifting without chart or compass and with hope fading away; they do not realize the ardent craving for some humble place to call home, where the family circle may be kept inviolate, and where there exists the assurance that nature, with the cooperation of the family, will furnish the necessities for actual subsistence.

Mr. President, there will be no paucity of applications if this Congress shall pass a bill providing financial aid for acquiring country homes by purchase or lease for those who formerly engaged in farming. The great problem will be taking care of the large number of jobless men, now walking the streets in despair and desperation, who want to return to nature's storehouse. With a cow and a sow, a hoe, a spade and a plow, and with food and feed supplies for a season, those who will can thereafter produce and preserve the food and feed necessities for the home, and be permanently removed from the large mass of the unemployed. Prospects for luxury? No; but removed from the bewildered and heart-bleeding mass of the unemployed, and with pride, confidence, and self-respect reasserted. Every one so removed from the ranks of the unemployed will not only lessen the requirements now resting so heavily upon State and city, and upon the charity of the public, but will also make room at the employment gate when industry can use more men.

On the same day I again spoke in support of the amendment. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 12540.) The amendment was defeated.

On June 23, 1932, I offered another amendment, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 13782, and which is as follows:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to loan to limited-dividend corporations, authorized to make loans to unemployed persons who have heretofore worked on a farm and who desire to return to the farm. Said loans shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed 5 percent per annum, and to be secured by mortgages on the land and stock bought with the money borrowed.

Said loans may be made for a period of 20 years, and the first installment on the principal may be made due 3 years after the date of the loan.

The loan may include a sufficient amount necessary for food and feed until a crop can be harvested.

Loans shall be limited to \$1,000 to individual borrowers.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make rules and regulations for making said individual loans, and unless borrowing limited-dividend corporations comply with the same the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not grant loans to such applicants.

I again addressed the Senate on the subject. The amendment was defeated.

In a conference with Mr. Roosevelt, prior to his nomination, I found that he was very greatly interested in the back-to-the-soil movement, and was then experimenting with it on a small scale in the State of New York. After Mr. Roosevelt's election and before his inauguration, I again discussed the subject with him and was informed by him that he was favorable to an appropriation by the Government to aid people who were stranded in industry and who had had previous farm experience to acquire small farms so located as to enable the homesteaders to secure part-time employment in industry. It was then agreed between us that I should introduce a bill on the subject.

On the 9th day of March 1933 I introduced bill S. 69. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BANKHEAD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks Senate bill 1503 introduced by me on April 17, 1933, the last bill being a revision of Senate bill 69.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BANKHEAD. Before action could be secured on that bill the President sent for me and stated that, in view of the large appropriation being made for emergency relief, he believed that it would be best to reduce the proposed appropriation in my bill from \$400,000,000 to \$25,000,000, and with that sum we could experiment with the problem and demonstrate

its value. He further suggested that the plan be couched in an amendment to be offered to the national industrial recovery bill, which was then pending before the Senate. In line with that suggestion I prepared an amendment and offered it in the Senate on May 15, 1933. It was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed. While the amendment was offered to S. 1712, the Finance Committee substituted H. R. 5755 for S. 1712, and that bill now is known as the "National Industrial Recovery Act." I ask unanimous consent to insert at this place in my remarks the amendment which I offered on May 15. After preparing the amendment I sent it to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

[S. 1712. In the Senate of the United States. May 15 (calendar day, May 24), 1933. Referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed]

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BANKHEAD to the bill (S. 1712) to encourage national industrial recovery, to foster fair competition, and to provide for the construction of certain useful public works, and for other purposes, viz: At the proper place insert the following:

"To provide for aiding the redistribution of the overbalance of population in industrial centers, \$25,000,000 is hereby made available to the President, to be used by him through such agencies as he may establish and under such regulations as he may make, for making loans and otherwise aiding in the purchase of subsistence homesteads.

"The moneys collected under said loans shall constitute a revolving fund to be administered as directed by the President."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Through Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, Director of the Budget, the amendment was submitted to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], Chairman of the Finance Committee, with the statement—

Which the President has asked to be added to the above-numbered bill.

The amendment was incorporated in the bill in the exact language prepared by me, and without any change or alteration was passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President.

There is a very wide-spread demand for the establishment of subsistence homestead settlements under this law. Applications for the location of such settlements from a very large number of communities have been received. The total amount applied for aggregates more than \$4,000,000,000. These applications are based upon a general recognition of the fact that it may be a long time, if ever, before all the people in the industrial centers who are now unemployed may again find work in normal lines. It holds out a form of permanent relief to those who are aided in securing subsistence homesteads.

Nearly all of the other relief measures afford only temporary relief and require recurring appropriations. It is my judgment that this measure points the way to a new type of rural life. The old homestead law, with its large acreage, led to the settlement and development of very large areas of our country. Public lands are no longer available, and for the present it is not desirable to bring about a substantial increase in commercial farming. A small acreage involved in the subsistence homestead plan provides means of earning from the soil the necessities for keeping body and soul together and for retaining inviolate the family circle and for development of family spirit. Such a life instills self-respect, and with proper diligence gives assurance that hunger will not molest the family.

I have noted with a great deal of satisfaction the program of the Emergency Relief Administrator, Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, who is now making plans for the relief of many unemployed by aiding them to become located on a few acres of land along the lines contemplated by the subsistence homestead law.

Mr. President, having made that statement, I desire to proceed with a discussion of the pending measure. The bill in its legal aspects, in its construction, and in its operation has been discussed for some days with very great learning and ability and thoroughness. As the discussion has pro-

ceeded I have marveled that so few Members of the Senate have taken any real interest in the contents of the measure, in the question of whether or not it is permissible under our Constitution, and in developing some understanding of what the bill really means.

During the last 3 weeks and at other times I have heard, with respect to other measures, discussions which have held the attention of the large majority of the Members of the Senate and kept them on the floor; but here comes a measure which involves a complete change in American jurisprudence, which involves the projection of the fourteenth amendment into many new fields and many ramifications, a bill which no one has been able to assert upon this floor is required under prevailing conditions in this country; yet, with all these important aspects, we find the Senator from Colorado, a good man, and about one Republican on the other side of the Chamber—I am not speaking of the present time—standing on guard to help the Senator from Colorado, and we find none of the other supporters of this bill here with an open mind and willing to get any grasp at all of what is involved in this program.

Mr. President, that is an unusual situation, a most unusual one; it is new to me, at least, in my limited experience in the Senate. I dare say that not one-half the Members of the Senate who have been voting on the test votes understand what is contained in this bill or the effect of it, and they do not seem to care whether they know or not. That is an unfortunate phase of it to those of us who believe that we understand the serious import of this attempted legislation. What does it all mean? There is some reason for a situation of that kind. It is not normal; it is not usual; it is not customary. Able men, with earnestness and with zeal, are standing here day after day pointing out to the Senate and to the country the unconstitutionality of the bill, with no effort on the part of its proponents up to this time to make any serious defense of its constitutionality, although, for some reason, back home, I presume, because of some conditions in their home States, for some reason regardless of what is in the bill, it may, perhaps, be assumed that a majority of the Senators are going to support it. That may be the assumption, and it may be well founded; I do not know.

Nevertheless, with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which have been read, with men of great character, men of outstanding legal talent, men of resourcefulness, expressing themselves with fluency and force and logic upon the floor, the proponents of the measure sit quiet day after day, and undertake in no way to justify the legal monstrosity which is sought to be rammed down the throats of a minority of the Senate.

Senators who are supporting the authors of the bill seem to take the same attitude about it. They apparently rely upon the thought that it makes no difference what may be said, that no argument, however persuasive, no decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, however thoroughly in point, will divert a single supporter of the bill from casting his vote in favor of its passage.

I say that situation is not a normal one. I say it is founded upon conditions which ought not to exist in the Congress of the United States. It is my judgment, though others may think otherwise, that groups of voters back home, whose leaders conceive that this proposed legislation is for their interest, and who have other groups with them to go to the polls, ought not to call Senators to account because of their support of a measure of this kind, simply because it has the support of such groups of voters; but, at least, Members of the Senate ought to give careful and grave consideration to a bill which is charged by some of the ablest Members of the Senate with being a gross violation of the Constitution of the United States when this is asserted by those who know so much more about the conditions at which the bill is leveled and the section of the country at which it is leveled, at least those who want to go along with the program ought to remain in the Senate Chamber and hear the protests of serious, deadly earnest

men. I am afraid the absent Senators are controlled by a thought which I can best express by relating an incident which occurred in Alabama.

In the early days there was an old hard-shell preacher in my section of the State of Alabama. Soon after the war he went to Baltimore on a visit. While he was there it was arranged that he should preach a sermon in the church of the family he was visiting. In accordance with the practice of hard-shell preachers he talked for about 2 hours.

When he got back home he was telling of his experience in preaching in Baltimore. He was asked how he got along and what the congregation thought of his sermon. He said, "I dunno. I caint exactly tell. After I'd been preachin' about 40 or 50 minutes a few of 'em begun to slip out. When I had preached more than an hour quite a lot of 'em were gone. When I got through my sermon there wasn't nobody left there but my relatives." He was asked, "How do you account for that?" He replied, "There ain't but one way to account for it, and that is that they caint stand sound doctrine." [Laughter.]

I think that is the reason why some of the advocates of the bill have been absenting themselves from the Chamber during the discussion of the measure. They cannot stand sound doctrine. They do not want to hear it. They have already heard the whisperings back home. They do not want to hear any further argument upon the bill.

Is there any politics behind the bill? Frankly, I say there is no party politics. The majority of the Democrats from the Northern States are for it and all the Republicans are for it. The Republicans started this program away back in 1921 and 1922 with the Dyer antilynching bill. They played with it for a year or two. I do not know whether or not they found out they were playing with a hot wire, but from the records I know they lost interest in it. They have never sought to follow it any further during the past 10 years. I imagine they found that the colored voters to whom they thought they were appealing were not interested in the program as they had understood they would be.

Those of us in the South who are associated with the colored people know they have no interest in a measure of this kind. I assert that those in the North who are expressing interest are merely the leaders who live upon the rank and file of the colored people. They take collections, contributions, donations, fees, and then, in order to justify their position of leadership, they must demonstrate some activity.

However, the Republicans dropped the bill in 1922. No one need think politics is involved, or, if any politics is involved, that it is party politics.

Then, lo and behold, after 10 years, when lynching has almost ceased in the United States, along come two Democrats, two northern Democrats, both of them good men, as I have said, one from New York, where there are millions of colored men and hundreds of thousands of southern white people, the other from the mountains of Colorado, where a great many people from my State and from other Southern States go in the summer to enjoy the cool breezes and western hospitality.

After the Republicans dropped the subject 10 years ago, here come my two good friends, one of them my desk mate, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], as courteous a gentleman as I have ever been associated with, but as badly misled a man as I have ever met. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this morning a labor delegation called to talk to me about the Wagner-Costigan labor-disputes bill. I will ask the Senator from Colorado if that is not the name of it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My name is not on that bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then I will say the "Wagner bill." I am sorry the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is not here. He runs in, the debate gets a little hot, and he runs out.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. In view of the statement made by my colleague a few moments ago about partisanship, if any, in this question, I desire to call attention to the fact that even though certainly some of the Republican leaders have indicated a great and devoted championship of this cause, thinking to get some political advantage from it, at the present time there is only one Republican Senator in the Chamber, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that is generally true. The Senator from New Hampshire is a good, faithful Senator. I like him. I will say that frankly about him; but, of course, he does not know anything about this problem. He lives too far away from it. He could not know anything about it. At any other time when a check is made, unless, perhaps, late in the afternoon, it will be found that there is about 1 Republican on guard, taking no interest in the subject, merely a follower of 2 Democrats, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to state that since my remark a moment ago another Republican Senator came through the Chamber—the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], whom, some persons have said, the lightning may strike in the Presidential campaign.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I imagine he thinks it will.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the rule as to the presence of a quorum ought to be enforced. It is presumed that a majority of this body is present.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahey	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkeley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], who is attending a meeting of a conference committee.

I ask that the announcement I made this morning as to the absence of certain Senators may be repeated and published in the RECORD and stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, when the quorum call came I was directing attention to the lack of interest in the bill we are discussing as demonstrated by the absence of Senators supporting it, and especially those on the Republican side. We have just had a quorum called, and yet when the result is announced we find five Republican Senators left in the Chamber—the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], and the junior

Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON]. I do not know how long they will be here. Judging from the way the other Senators hastened into the Chamber, answered the roll call, and hurried out again for fear they might hear some good sound doctrine, I suspect that some of those now present may disappear before many minutes. It is, as I said before, a very remarkable commentary on the situation. Here we have a group claiming that as a party they are standing up for the colored brethren, and they will not stay here, while a number of Democrats who are standing up for the colored brethren are sitting over here. That is what confronts us.

Mr. GLASS. What is the Senator's definition of a Democrat?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would not want to be offensive to some of my Democratic friends who affiliate with the Democratic Party, but my definition, for myself, is that a Democrat is one who votes in the Democratic primary and in the election for the Democratic nominees, from top to bottom.

Mr. GLASS. A man who does that is not always a Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would not associate with the Democratic Party if I did not have faith in its position, both in its platform and in the selection of its candidates.

Mr. GLASS rose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should be glad to have the Senator's definition.

Mr. GLASS. One definition of a Democrat I would give is that he is a man who believes in the rights of the States as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. One reason why I affiliate with the Democratic Party is that it has always stood for the old fundamental doctrine of State sovereignty and State rights. When we destroy it, Mr. President, as this bill would tend to do, and is an entering wedge in doing, we will then come to an inglorious day in our great American Republic. When we come, under a permanent program, to centralization, with power in the Federal Government and the administration, and enforcement of all criminal laws in the Federal courts, I say again to those who, for some conceived appeal to a small group of voters in their States, who are really not interested, support such a bill as this, they will regret that they have gone to such an extreme in breaking down the old time-honored fundamental principle of the Democratic Party of State rights and decentralization.

To be frank, I do not know whether the Senator from Virginia asked me the question because he wanted to hear me answer, or whether he wanted to give me something to talk about. [Laughter.] Whichever way he intended it, it is always a pleasing question to me, because I have never made any concealment of the fact that personally I am a party man. I respect those who have different judgments and have reached different conclusions upon subjects, but, as for me, I have long since reached the conclusion that in this Government of 120,000,000 people, representing all the groups and classes of our citizenship, far-flung, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf, living under different climatic conditions, having different soil conditions, different doctrines and beliefs, and different interests based upon geographical location, such as industrial or agricultural, there is but one intelligent way to get an expression of the people of the country as to its Government, and that is through responsible political party organizations. Whether we have two or have three or more parties is not important. That is the matter of the people grouping themselves into organizations which come nearer expressing their own convictions than other party organizations may do.

I say further, with perfect frankness, that when a citizen of this country finds himself entirely out of line with the fundamental conception of the party with which he is affiliated, when he loses confidence in the leaders of that party, in their good faith, both in securing legislation and in administering it, then courage and honor and manhood require him to affiliate himself with another political party.

Mr. GLASS. Suppose the other political party is just as bad as the one he proposes to leave. What is he to do?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My own view, I will say to the Senator from Virginia, and largely quoting a wise statement I heard him make here, is that the Democratic Party at its worst is better than any other party at its best.

Mr. GLASS. Yet, at the same time, there are Republicans better than some people who call themselves Democrats.

Mr. SMITH. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GLASS. If the Senator will permit me, the finest vindication of the sovereign rights of the States of this Union that ever I heard fall from mortal lips, not surpassed by the declarations of Thomas Jefferson himself, was uttered by Calvin Coolidge at William and Mary College when he delivered an anniversary address there. He warned the States of the American Union that if they did not more vigorously assert their rights, the Federal Government would invade them and take them away; and that is what is happening every day of our existence.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. GLASS. That statement consumed some time, did it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; it did, and I hope the Senator will inject some more good wisdom. I rejoice when the Senator interrupts.

I am sure everyone understands that in my proclamation of party loyalty and allegiance I had no thought of drawing any invidious comparison with any person who belongs to another political party. I recognize fully the sincerity of the views of others. I recognize that most of us, to be frank about it, have our political party affiliations as a result of inheritance. I think few Senators upon this floor will dispute that statement.

There are some who have changed, probably because of their conviction that the crowd with which they were running were not the best kind, as my friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] did. He got out of the Republican Party because their doctrines did not coincide with his, and I honor him for it, as I stated a while ago. It is fine. When a man's convictions incline him to dissociate himself with the party of his inherited views, I honor him for it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does the Senator think it is complimentary to the Democratic Party for the Senator from Colorado to quit the party to which he did belong and come and drag this miserable thing into our party?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado has made a bad mistake in judgment. I think his heart is all right, but he has made a bad mistake in judgment. I think that if he counted the colored voters in his State, to whom this bill is directed, he would find a majority of them opposed to raising a race issue, to stirring up strife between the white people and the colored race. Why does the Senator from Colorado, a State where there are only a few thousand colored people, and the Senator from New York, whose life has largely been spent upon the bench removed from contacts with the colored people, undertake to diagnose from long distance a race situation? It cannot be done, either in the case of physical illness or in a political situation.

I desire to say that I am a friend of the colored man. I know I am a better friend of the colored man than are either the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from New York, or the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who are insistent upon projecting this bill upon the statute books, thereby stirring up ill will, strife, and hatred among the races.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have listened with much attention to the splendid argument of the Senator from Alabama. I listened yesterday to one of the outstanding speeches made on this subject, the speech of the learned senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. I come from a State where all the Negro votes could be put in a man's hat, and he would

not have to wear a 10-gallon hat at that. I am supporting this bill, if I ever get a chance to support it, not because of any race controversy. The only time I have found the question of race raised has been when it was raised by the learned Senators from the South.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator will read the report on the pending bill submitted by the committee, of which I think he is a member—

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I was a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator will examine the brief, which is the only brief filed by the committee in support of its report, I think he will change his idea. Permit me to read from the brief, because the matter I shall read relates directly to the statement which the Senator is making:

This bill is especially limited by its own definitions to official action or nonaction resulting in the denial of due process or the equal protection of the laws. It applies only to persons injured or killed through mob violence on account of race, creed, or color.

What does the Senator have to say to that? The legal adviser of the committee makes that statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad to have the Senator propound that question, because, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt his speech—and I know he will be glad to have me do so—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I am delighted to have the Senator interrupt me. The Senator can speak an hour if he so desires.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is one time when I may have my way. I have in mind a case of mob violence which was even more outstanding than anything that ever occurred in the South, a case where there was no color involved, and where the Governor of a sovereign State, following that mob violence, said he would pardon those who might be arrested for the violence. The Governor of a sovereign State, speaking for a sovereign people, dared to utter that statement to a sovereign people 130,000,000 in number.

The Negroes have very little voting strength in the State I in part represent. The Negroes have no great voting strength, perhaps, in the other State from which that utterance of the Governor came. Yet it came from the Governor of that State, and the Nation was greatly shocked, and the President of the United States denounced the utterance.

Mr. President, I am using the time of the Senator, and I know he is impatient to continue. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let not the Senator worry himself about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am using the Senator's time because I say there is no color or race involved in this question, as I view it, unless the lines of color and race are brought in, just as the lines of creed might be brought in, which I know will not be done.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama permit me to ask the Senator from Nevada a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator from Nevada think he is justified in voting for a bill which would destroy the foundation of our dual form of government simply because in a certain State the Governor unfortunately, under provocation, prostituted his high office? Would the Senator here support a bill which, in the light of all the opinions of the Supreme Court, and in the opinion of as patriotic and unselfish Senators as ever sat on the floor of the Senate, is unconstitutional? Will the Senator vote to destroy the dual form of government, and do away with local self-government, because, perchance, here and there in a few States, or in all of them, there has been mob violence? Does the Senator think a commission appointed by the Federal Government is better qualified to decide the question of equity and righteousness than is a sovereign State, than are those who live in that State, and must live there? The Senator

has reached the point where he is willing to burn down the house to get rid of a rat.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield so that I may answer the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In my humble way I will say, in answer to the Senator from South Carolina, that I would build up the organic law, because I find from press reports and from official reports that the great sovereign States of the South regret these incidents of mob violence just as much as does any other State, and the great sovereign States of the South have been trying for years to find a solution for the problem. If the Federal Government can come in and offer a solution through a law passed by Congress to aid the South itself, I am for that law.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is begging the question because he knows nothing about the Gethsemane through which the South has passed. I am not blaming the colored race. I am blaming the carpetbaggers, the scalawags, and camp followers who, after the surrender at Appomattox, took charge of the finest civilization America ever saw. At that time the legislature of my State was composed wholly of ex-slaves, guarded by the bayonets of the Federal Government. No such prostitution of government in all civilization has ever been witnessed as that orgy of corruption of which my State was the victim. The Senator reckes not of the horrors which confronted what was without doubt one of the most cultured, refined, progressive States of the Union. It was a part of that section which gave to this Nation those who laid the foundations of our splendid Government. The Senator knows nothing of the struggle of that poor, intellectually helpless crowd, fired by all that characterizes "the lesser breeds without the law" to adjust itself to its new conditions, nor what it meant for us to be subjected to it.

I say here today, all honor to the Southern States which received the baptism of fire, not during the Civil War, when blood flowed on the devoted hills of Virginia, but when the homes and firesides and the intimate civilization of my country were jeopardized. Be it said to the everlasting honor and glory of the Negroes and the whites that they found a modus vivendi, and have been solving their problem with mutual racial respect each for the other.

I desire to say now on this floor that since the Civil War the national Democratic Party was our "pillar of a cloud" by day and our "pillar of fire" by night—not alone, perhaps, but the really civilized and civilization loving of those amongst the Republican Party saw to it that the civilization of the South should not pass away in spite of the emancipation declaration, which those on the other side viewed as a weapon of war to defeat the South.

I could quote from Mr. Lincoln when he said, "If the emancipation of the blacks will preserve the Union, I will emancipate them." My section of the country has stood solid for two reasons, one of which I shall mention, and that is the determination that we, as sovereign States, will settle our social questions for ourselves. We were supported by the liberty-loving Republicans and the staunch Democrats; and never since the Civil War, except once, has the solid South ever been broken. We expected, however, from the other side gestures to be made; but, with all due respect and honor to them, they never intended that there should be enforcement. Today, however, in the home and citadel of what we know as the national Democratic Party, we of the South, who know the conditions there, are betrayed by the introduction of this bill. When shall I or you, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], or you, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], stand on the hustings again and plead for State rights and our inherent and constitutional right to solve our problems as we are gloriously solving them? When shall you and I again, after the good year 1935, dare to raise our voices in behalf of the national Democratic Party when they have betrayed us in the midst of an overwhelming so-called "Democratic administration"?

I have heard it intimated that Members from certain States where the balance of power is held by the Negro race

dare not vote against this bill for fear that the balance will be turned to the Republican Party. In other words, it is being here argued that we should go to the extent of disrupting the Constitution, make State rights a thing of the past and local self-government forgotten in order that some gentlemen may warm the leather in these chairs. God help us to get back to where men would rather do right than to be Senators! I, for one, here today declare that if this proposal, involving the destruction of State rights and the usurpation of local self-government, becomes a part and parcel of Democratic doctrine, I shall pay no further allegiance to such a party.

I know the problems we face; and I want to say in concluding my remarks—and I am trying to help my friend from Alabama out in his time; he has been making a glorious speech, and I think I am making a darned good one, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator never made a better one; let him go ahead.

Mr. SMITH. I want to state to the Senator from Nevada that the thing which did more to precipitate the Civil War than anything else was just such unwarranted interference with our affairs as is now proposed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to say—

Mr. SMITH. I do not want the Senator to break in as yet; I want to finish this sentence.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not going to fight the Civil War all over again, anyway; there is no use talking about that.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator may have to do so, if he and his colleagues keep on with such measures as this. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I can sympathize with the men who come from States which for years and years were Territories. They were so accustomed to looking to Washington for everything when they were territories that they cannot get over the habit. [Laughter.] They do not belong to that class of States which had their own sovereignty before ever the Federal Government was created. It always does my heart good to know that the powers delegated to the Federal Government are enumerated and defined and all the remaining powers are reserved to the States and the people. It was grudgingly that the States yielded even the grant of power that is contained in the different articles of the Constitution; but here we find members of the so-called "National Democratic Party", because, forsooth, the governor of a State, perhaps under a provocation that I know nothing of, issued an unfortunate statement about his treatment of those who participated in a mob killing, urging this iniquitous measure. The Federal Government is composed of whom? It is composed of the people of the United States; and yet some Senators would concentrate into the hands of a few philanthropists, God save the mark, the destiny of my State and every other State in the Union because some Governor made a mistake. Other Senators do not believe a word of that, and neither do I.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH. I exonerate the Senator from Nevada, in view of what he stated about his purpose, but if this argument is continued much longer some of us are going to tell the truth. [Laughter.] I mean "the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help us God."

Mr. McCARRAN. I would expect that to come from the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Nevada; he knows that I always tell the truth without fear or favor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Absolutely.

Mr. SMITH. And God let the number grow greater. [Laughter.]

I know, as every other Senator knows, and as every decent citizen of America knows, why this bill is here. It is not any use for us to beat about the bush. I know why the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] introduced it; I know why the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] was a party to it; and at some time, unless this attempt is ended, as it ought to be by throwing this bill out the window, I am going to tell why.

Mr. President, I am much obliged to the Senator from Alabama for giving me the opportunity of getting this much out of my system.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the Senator has some more like it in his system.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, enough for 2 or 3 hours. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. And then some more.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I wonder where I should start in to answer the question which the learned Senator from South Carolina said he wished to propound to me?

Mr. SMITH. The Senator can start in right by voting against this infamous bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina, in answer to one suggestion he made which might be construed as an expression against the State which I in part represent, that my State never asked for anything from the Federal Government. We always gave; we gave billions of dollars for the Federal Government, and we gave a higher percentage per capita than did any other State in the Union to save the Government in the World War. We have never asked for anything from the Federal Government. So, if the learned Senator from South Carolina meant to reflect on my State because at one time it was a Territory, he has made a mistake in that regard.

Mr. SMITH. O Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. I will state what was the gist of my remarks. I do not know how much Nevada has given, and I do not know how much the Federal Government has given Nevada; that is not the point I made. The point I made was that Nevada was so long a Territory, governed from Washington, that Nevada does not have the same feeling about Washington as have the original States. Nevada was protected by the Federal Government while a Territory, and her Governors were appointed, until she got into the habit of sucking the Federal pap, and it seems that it is necessary to break her neck in order to make her quit it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARRAN. We never sucked that pap, and we always stood with the Government. We had only one Governor appointed as a Territorial Governor; then we came into the Union as a State, and we have been a State ever since we came in, which was in October 1864. We never asked for anything from the Federal Government; we poured billions—not millions—but billions out of the bowels of the earth to save the Government, and to maintain it, and we pay, perchance, a higher rate of taxes per capita than does any other State in the Union for State maintenance and otherwise. However, that is aside from the question.

What I should like to impress on the Senator from South Carolina—and then I am going to conclude, because I will have rested my friend from Alabama—is that I believe in State rights; that no one more ardently advocates the rights of the States in their sovereign capacity than do I; but I believe that much ballyhoo—and I use that expression advisedly—is being used against this bill because, under the doctrine of State rights, the States can prosecute such crimes as we have in mind, and the States want to prosecute them, but, because of certain conditions arising it is necessary for legislation of this kind to be enacted in order that the States themselves may awaken to their own conditions and responsibilities and prosecute crime.

I wish to say that I have followed the history of one case as I caught it from the columns of the press. That case arose in Alabama, right in the heart of Dixie, right in the heart of the South. That case has gone now twice to the Supreme Court of the United States. Ordinarily we might expect, in keeping with the doctrine that I hear coming from the South with reference to this bill, that the defendants in that case would have been taken out and lynched, but, let it be said to the credit of the South, they were not, but that time after time they were tried by a jury, then the case was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States;

the defendants are going back again to be tried by a jury, and, whatever the justice of the case may be let them have it.

I only make mention of this incident with reference to Alabama with no idea of criticism, but rather with an idea of commendation, because the South can handle this situation, and the South is making too much out of this bill. It is bringing reflection on itself; that is all it is doing. If as a matter of fact the bill should come to a vote and should be passed and become a law, it would speak the voice of the South, for, first, it proposes to adhere to the principles of the organic law; second, it proposes to support and maintain individual human liberty; and third, it proposes to see that every man shall have his day in court.

Southern Senators are making too much of this measure, and I am sorry they are doing so. I would rather see the bill become a law and let the South support it, because the people of the South believe in the protection of individual life. I know they do.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] during his interruption allowed by the courtesy of the Senator who has the floor, told me many things which I have read in the past. I would take nothing away from the chivalry of the South; I would take nothing away from her glorious history; I would take nothing away from her liberty-loving people and nothing from her views of State sovereignty; but they all come together into one idea that the South should support any measure which will lend a helping hand to the lowly and the humble and the unprotected. That is where Senators from the South seem to be making a mistake in this instance, and I am sorry.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DUFFY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I noted the statement that the South should help enact any law which would be of benefit to the lowly and the humble. I imagine there are none so lowly and humble usually as those who are arrested for crime.

I have here a copy of the Wickersham report relating to the brutality accorded prisoners in the United States. If there is any type of people the Government ought to try to protect it is its prisoners; and if we are going to depart from the idea of the States taking care of this matter, certainly the Government should protect its prisoners from the iniquitous third degree and from brutalities such as having their teeth knocked out, their bodies bruised and maimed by police officers and sheriffs. I think certainly we would all agree that is the type of people who should be helped.

I hold in my hand at the moment volume 1 of the Wickersham report on lawlessness in law enforcement. It should be very interesting to those who want to protect the weak and the humble to read this report.

I find, for instance, in appendix 4, that in the year 1930, out of a total of 1,235 cases, 289 defendants alleged they were beaten by police. For summary of these statistics see State of New York, chapter 2, section 3. This is the Wickersham report. Let us see what has been going on there. If we want to help the weak and the humble, let us help the people who need it most and in the greatest number.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say, if the Senator will pardon me, that I have read the report. I think I understand exactly the comment the Senator is going to make. I am very much in accord with the Senator's views regarding the report.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator, then, would believe it to be proper, if the bill were to be passed, to include an amendment to protect prisoners who are the victims of the third degree, who are kicked into insensibility, who are hit with blackjacks by the police, who are kicked and bruised and carried into police stations with their faces bleeding, their bodies maimed, their teeth knocked out, blackjacked and beaten with rubber hose, beaten, and kicked.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Where did that happen?

Mr. BLACK. In the city of New York in 1930. There were 289 such instances.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may interrupt, I think it is not confined to the city of New York.

Mr. BLACK. No; it is not. This is simply an illustration. The Senator is correct. It is not limited to New York; certainly it is not. It is wide-spread over the country.

The point I make is that there were 8 lynchings year before last and 14 last year. I am referring to this report, which shows that 289 prisoners were bruised, maimed, kicked, and their teeth knocked out by officers of the law. Yet here we are talking about enacting a Federal statute to protect 8 to 14, the maximum in 2 years, when in one city 289 people have been beaten and bruised by the officers of the law.

Not only that, but the reason why we are asked to pass this bill is inconsistent, because it relates to a crime which has been decreasing in number. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has several times called attention to the fact that it is said there were 5,000 lynchings within the period referred to. I deny that. I do not deny the Senator has those figures given him from certain sources, but I deny the figures are correct. They are not in keeping with other figures which have been gathered.

However, even conceding his statement, in the year 1910 there were in the United States 26,000 prisoners convicted of crimes ranging through homicide, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, forgery, embezzlement, fraud, stolen property, sex offenses except rape, violating liquor laws, carrying concealed weapons, and so forth. By 1925 this number had grown from 26,000 to 35,000. In 1931 the number had increased to 68,000. These crimes were growing in number. Lynchings were decreasing in number. The people of the States were protecting themselves from the hideous crime of lynching. The people of the States found themselves unable to cope with this growing mountain of crime until the Chief Justice of the United States was impelled to make the statement that crime conditions in this country are a disgrace to any civilized nation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the city in which those 289 instances occurred is in the State from which comes one of the authors of this bill?

Mr. BLACK. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that, frankly, I do not think this situation is limited to New York City or to any other one city.

Mr. SMITH. No; but the point I make is that that situation existed right under the nose of one of the coauthors of the bill.

Mr. BLACK. I make the statement that if we have reached the stage in this country where the States cannot and will not enforce their laws with reference to one crime, the instances of which have been reduced in number to eight in 1 year, it would be nothing short of folly on the part of the Senate to ignore the fact that it is our duty to protect those who are in the hands of the custodians of the law from having the thumbscrews put on them, and otherwise given the third degree and tortured by those in whose charge they happen to be.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How many votes does that prisoner crowd have? Has the Senator thought about the difference in the number of votes?

Mr. BLACK. I do not know exactly how many votes they may have. I think it is probably true that this group, constituting probably the lowliest group in America, probably need help most, if anyone is going to have a helping hand extended. They are the unfortunates who are charged with crime, sometimes guilty, sometimes innocent; but what the Wickersham report shows is that before they were proven guilty, even when they were merely on the way to jail and frequently after they were in jail, they had their teeth knocked out, their bodies bruised, their mouths made to bleed by reason of injuries inflicted by the very officers and custodians of the law themselves.

Then, is it to be said that it is proper to enact a law dealing with the only crime in America which is being reduced and ignore these poor people who have the third degree inflicted on them in every city in the Nation?

If this bill ever shall reach a vote, I intend to see that those who claim they are for the weak and the lowly and the humble shall have a chance to prove it. I intend to let it be demonstrated whether or not they will vote at the same time to protect those to whom I have referred from the thuggery and the violence and the viciousness of the sworn officers of the law in the various cities of the country. If the Federal Government can stop one crime, let it stop the others. Certainly, in my judgment, there can be few crimes any more reprehensible than for a sworn officer of the law, sworn to obey it, to take advantage of the situation and maim and bruise people, as they sometimes have, according to these reports, until the victims carry the marks even to their graves.

At a later time I expect to ask the clerk to read into the RECORD a list of the indignities and assaults that were committed upon prisoners. I simply desired the Senator's permission at this time to say, if we wish to pass a Federal law to stop crime, let us pass a Federal law to stop the crimes being committed upon the poorest and weakest citizens of the Nation.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. BYRNES. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahay	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. SCHALL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Spectator entitled "Dust."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I object to the editorial being printed in the RECORD without reading. I have no objection to its being read.

Mr. SCHALL. Very well; I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COUZENS. As long as the Senator from Alabama holds the floor, I object to having the editorial read in his time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHALL. Is there objection to printing the editorial in the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection both to printing the editorial without reading and to having it read.

Mr. BLACK. I understood that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] objected to having it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regret that my congenial friend, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has found it necessary to leave the Chamber. During

his interruption he emphasized the fact that there were practically no colored votes in his State, and apparently the reasoning behind that statement was that he was not influenced in any way by a group vote. I desire to call attention in his presence to the fact that within the past few days the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has placed in nomination for the Presidency the junior Senator from Nevada; so that gives him an outlook on a great deal more territory than merely the little handful of people in his own State.

I do not, of course, charge that the junior Senator from Nevada has any improper motive. I merely make the suggestion of his broader candidacy in answer to his own suggestion of a limitation upon the number of voters involved in this program.

The junior Senator from Nevada made reference to what are commonly known as the "Scottsboro cases" in Alabama, which twice came to the Supreme Court of the United States. I submit that no stronger argument can be made that the Southern States have the lynching situation in hand, and are making remarkable progress in dealing with it, than the very illustration brought to the attention of the Senate by the junior Senator from Nevada.

There was an alleged occurrence—I seek in no way to pass upon the facts—a common belief, at least, prevailed that nine colored boys had assaulted two white girls. The colored boys were promptly arrested. The very recital of what took place in itself would naturally stir the blood and the heart of every man and every woman; and if it were possible by any state of facts to justify violence, that situation would have justified it. But, Mr. President, it is doubtless well known to the Senator from Nevada that the law-abiding people of the great State of Alabama, resisting with all the resources in their power, mob violence and lynch law, having turned their backs many years ago upon that form of violence, came to the rescue of those colored boys, protected them, and carried them to the courts, where due process of law could be had.

As a result of the appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States the rule has been established that colored jurors shall serve upon juries in the South. The accused were given due process of law and the equal protection of the laws. As has been brought out here, promptly, in compliance with the mandate of our Supreme Court, which all good Americans recognize as the last word in legal jurisprudence, our Governor, a Democrat of years and years of tradition, his ancestors former Governors of Alabama, with all the southern background behind him, living in the heart of what is known as the "Black Belt", where the colored people predominate, promptly sent out a letter to officials all over Alabama saying, "We are bound by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Take the names out of your jury boxes; rebuild your jury boxes, and comply in letter and in spirit with the declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States."

No dissent in that good old Democratic State has been raised anywhere, because our best people are opposed to lynch law. We have contended against it. We have preached against it. Wherever it was possible, we have given any defendant, with whatever offenses he may have been charged, the protection of law, where the officials could reach the scene in time. It is well known that in numerous cases of aggravated offenses our national guardsmen have been called to the rescue of defendants. So why now attempt to cast this imputation and reflection upon the section which, under great difficulties, is fighting, and winning, the battle? Why here attempt to enact a Federal law which would provide that certain sections of the country, without naming them, have broken down the effort to give to all citizens the protection guaranteed to them by the fourteenth amendment? Why cast that reflection, when we all know what is behind this program, and what it means?

Mr. President, I am a friend to the Negro, as I said before, and I do not use the word "Negro" in any opprobrious way. Most of our colored people call themselves Negroes, and are

proud of their race, as has been stated here. I am a better friend of the colored man, the Negro, than either of the co-authors of the proposed legislation.

When my beloved father went out, under the colors of his State, as a mere youth, 19 years of age, as an officer in a Confederate company, there went with him a colored boy, a slave of the family. He went with my father throughout all the trying days, at times days almost of starvation, of those 4 long, cruel, and bitter years, and when the war was over, when conditions settled down, when reconstruction was in progress, and on down to the days of that colored man's death, he was a devoted friend of my father, and stayed with him as long as he lived. He had shelter, he had clothes, he had food, without distress, without anxiety. He had security all his days. That is the sort of relations which exist in the South in countless cases.

I say this to Senators, to show them my attitude toward the colored people. I am here pleading for the colored people, as their friend, as their neighbor, with knowledge of conditions. When the Ku-Klux Klan was in the zenith of its power and membership, when many of them were making an assault upon the Catholics, and the Jews, and the Negroes, when they held firm to the faith that white, native-born Americans and Christians should be given preference, I went out before the public and preached against religious prejudice and against prejudice based upon any creed, race, or religion.

I dare say there are Senators now here supporting this measure who kept deadly silent when the great gatherings of Ku-Klux members in their States were engaged in their anti-Negro, anti-Catholic, and anti-Jew campaigns. I went to the newspapers. I made no concealment of my stand, and when I was a candidate for the Senate, although there are about 3,000 Negro voters in Alabama, it is my judgment that every one of them voted for me, although I was the Democratic nominee. They know that I have no prejudice against them. They know that I want to be fair to them. That matter was put to the test.

Doubtless there are some here who stood silent when great groups of voters were parading, running the Negroes, denouncing the Catholics and the Jews; they stood silent then, but are here today trying to cast a reflection upon certain sections of this country because, forsooth, they say the law has broken down; that we are failing to give to a race that protection which the Constitution guarantees.

It has been said here that this is not a race question. Of course, on its face, it is not; but let us be frank with each other. Why try to deceive one another? Why try to deceive the country? If that question were not involved, how many would be here seeking to stretch the Federal jurisdiction over the police jurisdiction of all the States in this country in the way the bill proposes to do? As I pointed out when some Senators were out enjoying a nap, or eating luncheon, and not listening to the debate, here is the report on the bill submitted by the committee; here is a brief presented by the committee in support of the bill, which they put forward as a brief that is unanswerable, at least one entitled to great respect and support. They base their report as to the constitutionality of the bill upon a brief prepared by Mr. Tuttle, a New York lawyer.

I do not know whether or not Mr. Tuttle is a politician. I am sorry the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is not here to inform me something about Mr. Tuttle. I am assuming, however, that in this matter Mr. Tuttle acted as a lawyer; that he spoke what was in his mind and in his heart, as is the duty of all lawyers when called upon to give a formal legal opinion.

I do not know whether or not Mr. Tuttle wrote the bill. Even the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] is not here. We cannot keep either one of the proponents of this bill here. Six Republicans are now on the floor, one standing.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COUZENS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it. Mr. COUZENS. Has any business been transacted since the last quorum call was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that no business has been transacted.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it. Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A distinguished Senator offered for the RECORD an editorial, and permission was granted to have it read, but later objection was made, and the editorial was not read. I submit that that was the transaction of business and entitles me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COUZENS. I remind the Senator from Oklahoma that consent was not given to have the editorial read, because when the request was made I myself objected, and I now raise the point of order that no business having been transacted since the last quorum call, another quorum call is not now in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH. Request was made that an editorial be read, and objection was made. Was that not the transaction of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that it was not.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Appeal is taken from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has taken place, and the ruling of the Chair, from which an appeal has been taken, I suggest that we had better have a quorum call.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to have the pending question decided, because if what was done was not the transaction of business I am unable to say what it was. Compared with other things which have been done, it certainly was the transaction of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahey	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Stetwer
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of Senators as announced by me on a previous roll call, and ask to have that announcement stand on this roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Chair a question. Is that question debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is debatable.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] desires to have something to say about the appeal.

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. The Chair is sure the Senate will be glad to hear from either of the Senators from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I understand there is an appeal pending from the decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? The Senator from Alabama is recognized to debate that question.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, what was the decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, Mr. President; I yield to the Senator from Virginia if he does not take me off the floor.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator must yield when a parliamentary inquiry is made. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. GLASS. I desire to know what was the decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The decision of the Chair was that a roll call could not be had on the suggestion of the absence of a quorum because there had been no transaction of business by the Senate since the last quorum call was made.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry, because the question may become important. I make it in good faith, not for the purpose of taking up time, because I have all evening on the floor. My parliamentary inquiry is, What constitutes the transaction of business of a character which would permit the suggestion of the absence of a quorum and a roll call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Action by the Senate on resolutions, the introduction of bills, and so forth, are transactions of business. There are perhaps a hundred or two hundred matters which constitute the transaction of business by the Senate. The point made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] was that there had been no transaction of business by the Senate since the last quorum call; therefore, there was no quorum call. From the decision of the Chair an appeal was taken. The question now is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to propound an inquiry to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the printing in the RECORD of any communication which requires the consent of the Senate that it be done be the transaction of business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, that would be the transaction of business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is what has happened.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that objection was made to the printing in the RECORD and to having the communication read; so no business was transacted.

Mr. GLASS. Is not that the transaction of business?

Mr. CONNALLY. Was not that the transaction of business, I ask the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the request was made for the printing in the RECORD and objection was made, as objection was also made to reading of the communication; and, therefore, there was no transaction of business.

Mr. CONNALLY. But, Mr. President, if the request had been granted, it would have been the transaction of business. As it required consent or the nonconsent, why, if the

Senate refused to consent, is not that the transaction of business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the precedents of the Senate are as stated by the Chair.

#### SAFETY ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAYS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For what purpose?

Mr. KING. For the purpose of presenting a conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be submitted.

Mr. KING. I submit the conference report on Senate bill 408.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the Bill (S. 408) to promote safety on the public highways of the District of Columbia by providing for the financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles for damages caused by motor vehicles on the public highways in the District of Columbia; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

WILLIAM H. KING,  
ROYAL S. COPELAND,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,  
WRIGHT PATMAN,  
ERNEST M. DIRKSEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. COSTIGAN that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, action on the conference report was intervening business, was it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The adoption of the conference report constituted the transaction of business.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So that a quorum call would now be permissible?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Byrnes	Glass	McCarran
Ashurst	Capper	Gore	McGill
Austin	Caraway	Guffey	McKellar
Bachman	Carey	Hale	McNary
Bailey	Clark	Harrison	Minton
Bankhead	Connally	Hastings	Moore
Barbour	Coolidge	Hatch	Murphy
Barkley	Costigan	Hayden	Murray
Bilbo	Couzens	Johnson	Neely
Black	Dickinson	Keyes	Norris
Bone	Dieterich	King	Nye
Borah	Donahey	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Brown	Duffy	Lewis	Overton
Bulkley	Fletcher	Logan	Pittman
Bulow	Frazier	Loneragan	Pope
Burke	Gerry	Long	Radcliffe
Byrd	Gibson	McAdoo	Robinson

Russell	Smith	Trammell	Wagner
Schall	Steiner	Truman	Walsh
Schwellenbach	Thomas, Okla.	Tydings	Wheeler
Sheppard	Thomas, Utah	Vandenberg	White
Shipstead	Townsend	Van Nuys	

Mr. LEWIS. I reannounce the absence of certain Senators and the reasons given therefor, and ask that they apply to the present roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I express my regret that it seems impossible to discuss this bill with its authors. I had to make an argument here some time ago with both authors of the bill out for an hour or two, and I was unable to secure their attention. I really had been hopeful that they would be responsive to some of the suggestions and arguments I was submitting. Furthermore, I notice on the Republican side only seven or eight supporters of the bill are here immediately following a roll call. They just will not remain here. I have an idea that they are not greatly interested in this bill. That is the way they do, and it is regrettable that when some of us are deeply concerned about a proposal to change the whole jurisprudence of America, which a great majority of Senators over on the other side are supporting, they do not remain.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It depends on what the Senator wants. I do not desire to lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will not lose the floor if he yields for a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well, sir.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish to inquire of the Senator what is the question before the Senate? Is it the merits of this bill or whether the Senate shall take it up?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator from Delaware would remain in the Chamber, he would know more about it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Not from the argument of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has absented himself practically throughout this whole debate and then comes here and wants me to give him information.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it not true that the question before the Senate is whether we shall take up this bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If that is all the Senator knows about the status, there is no use in trying to inform him.

Mr. HASTINGS. Cannot the Senator answer the question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can say that it looks suspicious to me that certain members on the other side are either joining in a filibuster or trying to break a quorum; at any rate, we can not keep them here.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator does not accuse us over here of conducting a filibuster, does he?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think I might do so when it is evident that we cannot keep Senators over there on the floor. It is in the nature of a filibuster when so many Senators are out all the time and we do not have a chance to discuss anything with them and have to keep calling the roll in order to try to get them back. It looks to me to be a very effective form of killing time.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the Senator will discuss the question before the Senate we will stay here and listen.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not believe a word of that, because Members of the Senate know that I have been discussing this measure for much of the day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Delaware said something about a filibuster.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COUZENS. May the Senator from Alabama hold the floor while the Senator from Texas makes a speech?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He cannot, but he may yield for a question.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from Texas was not asking a question but was quoting the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not know that it was an offense in the Senate to quote the Senator from Delaware. [Laughter.] I do not know of any rule that says that another Senator may not quote the Senator from Delaware. I was undertaking to ask the Senator from Alabama if it is not a fact that the filibuster on the other side of the aisle is against bringing up the soldiers' bonus bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, it has that effect. I am going to argue that point a little later. [Laughter.] I am going to invite the attention of the authors of this bill, before I conclude, to the fact that there are quite a number of measures on which the only chance in the world the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Michigan and others will get a chance to vote on their final passage is by making an omnibus bill out of this one and letting this bill pull through with it some really helpful, remedial legislation for which some of the Senators on the other side will not vote in any other way.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. HASTINGS. I should like to inquire if the reason for trying to prevent the bill coming before the Senate is because the Senator from Alabama feels that a majority of the Senate would be in favor of it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think if the Senator has any judgment at all he would know that.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. My colleague referred to the fact that there is evidently a filibuster in progress against the soldiers' bonus bill. Everyone here knows that the effort to bring the antilynching bill before the Senate is going to prove futile. Everyone knows that it cannot be done. Everyone knows that if this matter were out of the way the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill would be brought before the Senate. Not only that, but we could then proceed to consideration of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; we could then take up the social-security legislation. Members of the Finance Committee would have time to proceed with its consideration.

It is a little strange that Senators on the other side of the Chamber who are the most vigorously opposed, judging by their record in the past, including the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], to payment of the soldiers' adjusted compensation, those who are really opposed to the labor-disputes bill, those who are opposed to giving organized labor a decent chance, those who are opposed to the social-security measure, should be conducting a filibuster at this time in order to keep the Senate tied up on a measure which never will come to a vote in the Senate.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does either Senator from Alabama dispute that he is conducting a filibuster?

Mr. BLACK. I will state that the Senator from Delaware is doing that in joining with his colleagues to prevent the soldiers' bonus bill from being considered.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COUZENS. Who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has the floor. The Chair is of the opinion that none of the Senators know what is before the Senate. The Chair will state for their information that the question is the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and whether

the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK. I stated that a few moments ago. Therefore it is very pertinent to call the attention of the Senate to the filibuster which is being conducted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] and others against the soldiers' adjusted-compensation bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. With very great frankness, I realize that we have before the Senate an appeal from the decision of the former occupant of the chair. I assume that in due course we will reach a vote upon that question.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask the Chair to state what is the status of the appeal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The former occupant of the chair sustained the point of order made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] that no business had been transacted by the Senate and that therefore no quorum call could be had. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] appealed from the ruling of the Chair. That appeal is now pending before the Senate. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. LEWIS. Is it not true, sir, that a roll call has been had since and the presence of a quorum ascertained?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That does not change the status of the appeal from the decision of the Chair. That merely determined the presence of a quorum of the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. I have no desire to question the view of the present occupant of the chair but am merely desirous of making clear the question which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, the question is merely academic now because there has been transacted certain business since the decision of the Chair and there has been a quorum called as well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nevertheless, the then occupant of the chair made the decision, and the Senator from South Carolina appealed from the decision. Therefore that appeal must be decided by the Senate as to whether the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. GLASS. I insist the whole thing will be merely academic.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will allow me—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. It is not academic because it involves a principle. We must determine whether, when a Senator submits a request to have an article read into the RECORD and objection is made, that objection under the rule of the Senate does not constitute the transaction of business which is authorized by the rule, whereas if no objection is made and the article goes into the RECORD, it is the transaction of business. It seems to me either action would constitute the transaction of business on the part of the Senate. I desire to make the point that it is not merely academic. It is a point which may govern us hereafter.

Mr. GLASS. It is academic because, since then, business has been transacted and there has been a quorum call. If the Senator from South Carolina wants a practical vote on the question, since there has been no transaction of business since the last quorum call, let him call now for a quorum and let the Senator from Michigan make his point of order and let the decision be made.

Mr. SMITH. But the question is still here. The question is still whether or not the attempt to read into the RECORD an article and the submission of an objection to that request constituted the transaction of business. The objection was made as provided by a rule of the Senate, and the objection is invoked as contradistinguished from acceptance of the offer. One is negative; the other is affirmative. If one constitutes business, necessarily the other constitutes business. I insist we ought to settle the question as to whether the offering to read into the RECORD of an article an objection being made thereto constitutes the transaction of business.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that there are at this time three proposals pending before the Senate: First, an appeal from the decision of the Chair; second, a motion to strike from the original motion certain figures which identify the original so-called "antilynching bill" and substituting in place thereof figures identifying the so-called "bonus bill"; third, a motion to proceed to the consideration of the antilynching bill?

There are three distinct proposals standing before the Senate. My parliamentary inquiry is, How many questions can be before the Senate at one time?

Mr. SMITH. Let us debate them all. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will undertake to answer the Senator from Oklahoma. There can be but one proposal pending before the Senate at a time. The Senator is correct that the question before the Senate at the present time is whether the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the Senate. The second proposal mentioned by the Senator from Oklahoma was withdrawn by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The third proposal mentioned by the Senator from Oklahoma is the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] to proceed to the consideration of the so-called "antilynching bill." That covers the situation.

The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, since apparently the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] has started to police the rules of the Senate, I think the question has passed beyond the point of being academic and is now practical. I am now speaking on the appeal and not on the bill. I may by inference make some allusions or suggestions which might have some bearing on the bill. It is a very good idea to have time to think over and deliberate on the vote which may be taken on the appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield for a question.

Mr. BLACK. I notice the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is leaving the Chamber.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We cannot keep him here.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to call the attention of my colleague to the fact that the Senator from Delaware asked a question as to what is pending before the Senate. I want to be courteous to the Senator from Delaware, and I should like to ascertain if he knows now what is before the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the Senator from Delaware is not concerned about what is before the Senate, so I am not going to follow up the matter with him.

Mr. President, as I said I think it is a good idea from the practical standpoint for us to have a little time to deliberate and find out where we stand and what we are after and how we are going to get it and what we are driving up to, and a number of other points, because they might have a bearing in the minds of some practical statesmen as to how they may vote on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, which seems to involve some dispute as to the facts.

Mr. President, I think it is pretty well understood, at least I have heard a good deal about it, though I do not charge it, but it is in the air, that there are certain Members of the Senate who are supporting the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], who are bitterly opposed to legislation which is going to be brought before the Senate for consideration as soon as this matter shall be disposed of in some way. My colleague made a brief reference to some of those measures. We have had the bonus question before us for a long time. We have now for consideration, if we can ever get to it, that much debated question. The ex-service men are waiting for payment of the bonus and are hopeful that they may not have to go to the poorhouse before we get around to its payment. We have that problem before us, not only as to whether they shall be paid but when they shall be paid and how they shall be paid. While a great many of us desire to proceed to the consideration of that

subject, we know that the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Vermont, and other Senators who apparently are willing to have this bill stay here until doomsday are not interested in the payment of the soldiers' bonus in the way it seems as if it may be paid, and that is through the route of the Patman bill.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. Since the Senator has mentioned the opposition of certain Senators to the soldiers' bonus, I desire to call attention to another fact. I may be mistaken, but I am reasonably sure that in 1932 the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] made a very vigorous attack, which is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, against the payment of the soldiers' bonus, and, of course, those who are against the payment of the soldiers' bonus naturally will continue to filibuster to keep it from coming before this body.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; and there are some other measures of vital importance which are threatening to come up, and will come up. If the friends of the soldiers wish to secure bonus legislation within a reasonable time, so as to provide relief for the soldiers, it strikes me they ought to offer the bonus bill as an amendment to this bill. There are numerous reasons why that should be done. In the first place, in that way we will get action on it as quickly as we will get action on anything else in the Senate if this bill stands as prior to everything else in the order of business.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. Responding to the suggestion of the able Senator from Alabama that the bonus bill should be tendered as a substitute for, or amendment to, the present bill, I ask the Senator what is his judgment as to whether that proposal would receive the votes of those who are now supporting the present bill or of those who are opposing it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My judgment is that if the bonus bill were put on this bill as an amendment, they would be afraid to vote against the bill. Of course they would go along and vote for it.

Mr. LEWIS. Whom does the Senator mean by "they"?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean some of the Senators on the other side to whom I have been referring, who apparently are so anxious to obstruct business here.

If they will bring up the bonus, and there is a majority of the Senate for it—we are the judges of its germaneness under the rules of the Senate—we can put the bonus on this bill, and we can put it on in the form which a majority of the Senate favor. We can put it on, if we have a majority of the votes, by the inflation route, paying the bonus through the issuance of additional currency.

I know there are many Members upon this floor who are in favor of the expansion of the currency. I know there are many who have no fear of the charge of fiat money so long as there is concealed in the vaults of the Treasury a sufficient quantity of gold to support, to the extent of 100 percent, all currency necessary to be issued in payment of the bonus. I should like to see the test made here. I should like to see what Senators will squirm and what Senators will turn their backs upon the pending program, if they come to the choice of voting for both this program and the payment of the bonus through an issuance of currency to cover the gold and silver in the Treasury.

We desire to deal with the bonus question after these long years of delay. I am sure a majority of the Senate does. Why do not the Senators on the other side who favor this bill, and who also favor the bonus, put the bonus bill on this program? It will make the present bill stronger to put it on. It will, as I have indicated, force Senators to vote for the passage of this bill who will not vote for the passage of a good bonus bill.

What about the 6-hour bill? Is not that measure being delayed by this insistence upon continuing before the Senate a bill which every sensible Member of the Senate knows

can pass only when thirty-odd Senators have exhausted every possible resistance and exhausted physical endurance? I have been frank, as I said, from the beginning of this program. I am not going to submit, if I can help it, to the passage by Congress of a bill which bears an imputation and a reflection upon the people of my State, who are doing all in their power, everything they can do and everything that is being done in the other States, to prevent murder, to prevent lynching, to apprehend the guilty, to afford those accused of crime protection even through the use of the National Guard; who are using every resource available to them to give every citizen in their States, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, the equal protection of the laws, and due process of law under the fourteenth amendment.

Our people have been hounded for years on this question, beginning back with the soldiers at the polls following reconstruction, beginning back when the rights of States were challenged and denied and ignored, and elections were held with soldiers at the polls; a people who were threatened here with the passage of the force bill to control elections, a measure which tied up Congress for months and months and months as a direct assault upon the institutions of the South. Now we have as honest elections as are held anywhere in the world. We fought off, we fought down, we beat back this assault upon our section and upon our people and our institutions, and said, "Let us alone! We have a great problem, a complicated problem, a difficult problem, in dealing with a race of new freedmen, not prepared for the duties of intelligent citizenship, not fully prepared to understand their duty to obey all the laws of the country. We shall have to work along in the course of evolution and progress; but we in the South, with these people constituting almost half the population, have more interest, if possible, than people from a great distance in working out this problem, in adjusting it, in helping the new freedmen to develop as good citizens, and to take their place in the political and other organizations in accordance with the position they deserve."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I charged here some time ago—I did not, of course, intend to be in any way offensive about it; I thought I was stating the plain, unvarnished fact—that a certain group of Republicans on the other side of the Chamber—not the Progressives, but the old-line, stand-pat group of Republicans—were fighting off this bill so as to avoid coming to a vote on the cash payment of the bonus. Not a single voice was raised among that group of Senators then upon the floor to deny the charge. Not a single protest was made at the suggestion that they are filibustering, in a way, that they are purposely absenting themselves from the floor; and now only two Republicans are on the floor of the Senate—the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. We cannot keep the Republican Senators here. They are delaying the progress of the Senate through the necessity of having roll call after roll call while they quietly stay at their offices. Of course, the conclusion is almost inevitable that there is some motive, some reason somewhere for the protraction of this debate, for the delay in disposing of this bill.

While I think the Senators on the other side ought to stay here, while I think they ought to listen to sound doctrine, while I think they ought to take some interest in a measure with which they are willing to block the progress of the Senate, still they are unwilling to do it. That, of course, is their privilege.

Let me say to my Democratic friends who, with the others, are supporting this measure—and I say it to the two distinguished coauthors of the bill, who are at all times interested in remedial legislation, in humane legislation, in progressive legislation—they have fallen into a trap; other Senators, who are opposed to their views upon legislation which is yet to come before us, have, so to speak, put rings in their noses, and are leading them here day after day in the continuance of the debate on a measure which will never pass the Senate, at this session of Congress, at least.

Ah! it is pathetic to me to see a good many like my desk mate, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], who is friendly at all times—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator yield so the Senate may receive a message from the House of Representatives?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. HARTIGAN, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, and 38 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. COSTIGAN that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, while this bill is confessedly a sectional bill, and so described in the report of the committee, the one disturbing thing is that it has passed out of the control and manipulation of the Republican Party, and now we find a majority of the Democrats in the Senate of the United States stepping up and taking out of the hands of the Republicans a sectional program dropped by the Republicans 10 years ago. We find two Democratic Senators, supported by a majority of the Democrats in this body, taking over control of an issue abandoned by the Republican Party.

Why is that, Mr. President? Ten years ago, when the Republican Party undertook the passage of the Dyer anti-lynching bill, I am sure, not from any statement made to me by any responsible Republican but from general knowledge of conditions and observation thereafter, they found there was no demand for such legislation among the responsible colored people of this country.

Why else did they drop it? They never sought to resurrect it. They did at last, upon the race question, obtain a ray of information and intelligence, and did succeed in submerging political party interests in order to help beat back the race issue. They found that the lynching problem was no longer a sectional problem, no longer a race problem. They found lynching occurring in New York and in other States. I do not know whether there was ever one in Colorado or not, but lynching has occurred in probably every other State. So the Republicans finally found, so far as they were concerned, that a race question was not involved, and so they abandoned such legislation. Now, they are trailing behind Democratic leadership, Democratic authors, a Democratic majority, in support of the measure; but it might as well be understood, in fairness to every Senator who has to go "on the spot" on this subject, that the effort to pass the bill is not a part of the Republican program. If it is anything, it is a part of the Democratic program, because it is sponsored by Democrats, and supported by a majority of the Democrats in the Senate.

Why do I say it is confessedly a race program regardless of the denial of the great Senator from Colorado? He says he does not see any race question in it. I assume it is also the view of the able Senator from New York that there is no race question in it.

I do not know who wrote the bill. I assume, of course, those Senators did. I know that the committee which reported it had the advice of an able lawyer, a constituent of the Senator from New York, a Republican, I assume, and a

former Republican officeholder, but a man who I understand to be a good lawyer.

At any rate, the committee, after what they say was an exhaustive investigation of the briefs of the advocates of the bill, wrote the bill we are now discussing. There was no examination and report on the briefs of those who opposed it, no investigation of the great debates participated in by the eminent lawyers and statesmen upon the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives 10 years ago on the constitutional phases of the bill. No; there was no investigation of that sort. The bill was reported by a committee which frankly says, "We looked into the authority to do this thing, but we ignored everything that was said against the authority to do it."

What does this lawyer say? Notwithstanding the expressed statement of the Senator from Colorado on the subject, I wish to talk plainly and without offense. I certainly do not want to offend anyone. I am doing my best to protect the Democrats who have gone astray on this matter. I do not want them to be hurt. I want them to come back to the Senate regardless of how they vote on this question, because, as I have said, the worst sort of a Democrat is better than the best sort of a Republican. [Laughter.]

I do not know whether or not Mr. Tuttle, the official lawyer, apparently, for the committee, was acting as amicus curiae; I do not know whether or not he got a fee; I do not know whether he was sent here by a group of sociologists of the type that has been in touch with the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York. They have not been in touch with the rank and file. They have been consulting sociologists, theorists, economists, highbrows among the colored race and the white race, not those who go down in the workshops and talk to the colored man, not those who have any knowledge of conditions in the section against which the bill is directed. No; they have no knowledge of those conditions. They are merely importuned by groups of sociologists and highbrow colored men who are living and holding their places out of the sweat and labor of the common colored man.

Oh, yes; they are the ones doing the agitating. We have not heard any word from men like those in the Tuskegee Institute, the Booker Washington type, and the Dr. Moton element in the South, that the South wants this bill or that the colored men want it.

Who knows what is best for the colored race? If you want to help the colored race, I shake hands with you, but for God's sake do not take your advice from those who know nothing about conditions. Do not do something which will stir up race feeling and race prejudice, as surely as we are living, and give to a low order of people the idea that the Government of the United States is going to protect them regardless of what sort of crime they may commit. Do not get that sort of idea into their heads. If you want to help the colored man, talk to the friends of the colored race, those who live among them and understand them. Talk with the men who have the confidence of the colored men in the South. Talk with the men who have so conducted themselves toward the colored race in every way as to command the confidence and respect of the great mass of colored people in the sections in which we live.

Oh, no; that is not the source of information which some people desire on this subject. In fact, from the attendance we now have in the Senate, I do not believe they desire any information at all.

Let us see what Mr. Tuttle had to say about the subject. He wrote a document for the committee. The committee thought so much of it, it appealed to them as so well and so truly expressing what is involved in this proposed legislation, that they picked out this opinion from all the legal documents available to them as giving true expression to the purpose and intent of the bill. Now, notwithstanding that has been done, we find a denial of what the opinion selected by them, and reported by them, says is the purpose of the bill.

Let me read to the Senate from this brief:

This bill is expressly limited by its own definitions to official action or nonaction resulting in the denial of due process or the equal protection of the laws.

Now listen:

It applies only to persons injured or killed through mob violence on account of—

Listen—

race, creed, or color.

Did Senators hear that? A committee brings the bill to the Senate with the statement connected with it that the bill applies only to those injured on account of race, creed, or color, yet we hear the statement made, "Oh, this is not a sectional matter; this is not a race matter. Why, there was a mob and a lynching in California. That makes it national. Oh, yes; this question is national."

Let us see what else the committee said. I desire to call the attention of the Senate—it was briefly mentioned yesterday—to an argument made by the committee in its report. It says:

In the committee's opinion, it is more than a coincidence that the practice of lynching is practically stopped when Federal legislation designed to curb this practice is pending in Congress. A continuation of the practice of lynching, coupled with a complete failure of the government of those States involved to apprehend and punish the participants of these crimes supports the need for Federal legislation. \* \* \*

During the first week in June 1934 word was generally circulated that hope for the enactment of the proposed measure had been abandoned. On June 8 there was a lynching in Mississippi, followed—

By other lynchings.

Word circulated that a bill, the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill, had been abandoned. Who authorized the statement that it had been abandoned? Was any such declaration ever made on the floor of the Senate or in the newspapers? Who circulated word all over America that a bill had been abandoned in Congress? I ask any lawyer, I ask any man of common judgment, if the abandonment of a bill in Congress would, anywhere in the South, stir up a mob to commit murder?

In the first place, there is no means for general whispering campaigns. In the second place, everyone knows that no mob, stirred to insane frenzy, composed usually of totally irresponsible people, is going to pay any attention to the law on the subject. Such people do not stop to ask whether there is a Federal law on the subject. They know there is a State law against murder and that it is punishable by death in my State. They know the law is there. Senators, in the high tides of passion, any aggregation of men, governed by mob psychology, led by some dangerous and irresponsible agitator and leader, does not resort to judgment and reason. Such men do not investigate what particular section of the law, whether State or Federal, governs the case. That is totally an afterthought.

Let us see if the committee was consistent in its statement. It said the word was spread around. I do not know whether that means that it was spread in churches or in Sunday schools or in lodge meetings. The Senators must have a very exaggerated idea of the general knowledge about the details of handling the bill of which they are authors if they imagine that the mere whispering somewhere by somebody that a bill had been temporarily laid aside was responsible for mob lynchings thereafter during the year. That is a far-fetched conclusion.

I call the attention of the Senators who appear to be, and who, I assume, are seriously supporting this drastic bill—this revolutionary bill, this bill destructive of State rights, this bill which will destroy existing peaceable race relations, which, in my judgment, will increase rather than reduce the number of cases of violence taking place thereafter—to the figures put into the Record a few days ago by the very able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], figures furnished him by the outstanding Negro college in America, a colored institute with a research board, with a tremendous foundation fund, with all the financial backing it needs in order to operate in all reasonable lines of activity. With a research board, with a statistical board, with every available avenue and source of information, they have been collecting the statistics on this subject during the years.

What do those statistics show? I am not bringing up this subject to repeat the figures.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Coolidge	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Copeland	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahey	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Stelwer
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A moment ago the Senator from Alabama made a statement with reference to Dr. Moton, of Tuskegee Institute. It is my recollection that reference was also made to Dr. Moton a day or two ago by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

I am advised that Dr. Moton is a vice president of the Interracial Commission, from which a telegram, subsequently placed in the Record, was received last Friday, and that Dr. Moton was an organizer and has actively participated in the activities of the Interracial Commission throughout its history.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no doubt about Dr. Moton being opposed to lynching. Dr. Moton has never read the bill and endorsed it. If he had, the Senator from Colorado would have so stated. I do not believe he would endorse the bill. I am sure there is no evidence that he has done so. The Senator from Colorado has no such evidence, or he would submit it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think it is already of record that the Interracial Commission has endorsed legislation of the type of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I am not familiar with exactly the resolution adopted by the interracial group, but I did note an article in the New York Times of last Sunday, which perhaps the Senator from Colorado may have seen, an article written by Mr. Julian Harris, of Georgia. It is my recollection, though I would not be absolutely sure of my recollection, that the article stated that the group on interracial relations, while opposed to lynching, did not intend to endorse any particular bill. The article can be easily obtained. It was in last Sunday's New York Times.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield further—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It should be said that the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] accurately states the position of the Interracial Commission, so far as I now recall it. That commission, which for a number of years has declined

to endorse Federal legislation, recently endorsed antilynching legislation by the Congress, but did not, I believe, go so far as to endorse the particular measure now under discussion in the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have just stated that, in my judgment, Dr. Moton, who is the head of the greatest colored institution in this country, who understands the rapidly improving race conditions in the South, and is in large measure responsible for their improvement, who understands the diligent efforts made by the people of all the States in that section, including their law officers, to enforce all laws, regardless of race, creed, or color—Dr. Moton would not give his approval to this bill, which so many of us earnestly and sincerely believe will promote strife and discord and racial disturbances.

Why does the Senator from Colorado think he knows more about the race situation in the South than do those of us who live there? Does he impugn our sincerity in saying that we are friendly to the colored race; that we are opposed to mobs and to lynchings; that we are handling the situation; that we are making wonderful progress? Does he impugn our motives? He must recognize that we know more about the problem than does any man who lives a thousand miles away. He must know that those in direct contact with this situation better understand how to diagnose it, how to treat it, and how to bring health and security out of it, than does any Denver doctor a thousand miles away who has never seen the patient.

That is the situation. We are up against an absentee diagnostician, encouraged by sociologists, encouraged by professional groups, not encouraged by the great mass of colored people, not approved by the leaders of the colored people in that section.

Senators talk about lynching as a national menace. It is absurd. Any lynching, of course, is unfortunate.

Mr. President, in my own home county, in the period of more than 125 years since it was organized there has occurred only one lynching; and the man lynched was not a negro, but a white man. In many counties in my State there has never been a lynching in their whole history; and still we hear theoretical doctors of race relations tell the Senate and tell the world through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the news service, "Oh, we have a situation that is so horrible, so menacing, so distressing that we must strain the Constitution of the United States"—and they are bound to know they are straining it—"and extend it into fields it has never before sought to cover in order to deal with a terrible, disgraceful, menacing condition of lynching and mobbing."

Mr. President, I say there ought to be potent supporting facts of overwhelming force and convincing power to show that there is a menace to our institutions, to a group of our people, before we undertake to confer local police power upon the Federal courts of the country.

The Senator from Colorado seems to think that if participants in lynchings can be dragged into the Federal courts they will be punished. Why take them to the Federal courts? We have not the type of carpetbag judges we used to have. We have local men presiding over the Federal courts in our section. We have the same type of citizens serving upon the grand juries in the Federal courts that serve upon the grand juries in the local courts. We have the same type of trial jurors in the Federal courts that we have in our local courts. The Senator from Colorado, however, seems to have the idea that there is such a dread of a Federal judge, of a Federal court, constituted of our local people, that if Uncle Sam's name is put on it that is going to alarm and frighten everybody out of doing things that otherwise might be done.

So far as the actual effects of trials is concerned, I should have no serious objection to a Federal court trial; but I do denounce any effort to break down our dual system of government, our local courts. I do denounce any program to jerk citizens up and haul them away two or three or four hundred miles to the seat of some Federal court, as must be done in many States of the Union, with their broad areas, under the program sponsored here by the Senator from Colo-

rado; and I do object, as a lawyer, as a practitioner, as an American citizen, to any program which seeks to place the Federal Government directly in control of the enforcement of the police laws within our States.

Some time ago we had pending before us a bill to extend the power of the Federal courts to the prosecution of one of the most heinous crimes in this country, namely, kidnapping. Shortly after the terrible tragedy in the Lindbergh home, which so deeply stirred the people of this country, which aroused such intense interest and sympathy, which evoked the indignation of every man and every woman in America, when the bill was pending here to give Federal control over the horrible crime of kidnapping, I note that neither the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] nor the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] proposed to extend the scope of the bill to kidnapping within a State. They stood here with the same sort of indignation that all Americans had, with the same desire to stamp out and destroy the terrible crime of kidnapping, which at that time and for some months before that time had spread all over the country, and had gotten to be almost a daily occurrence. Great amounts of money were extorted. Men and women were taken into hiding, into seclusion, with their families, their husbands, their wives, their children, in suspense, in desperation. My God! What greater suffering could be brought to a family than the realization that one of its members is in the secret possession of bandits and outlaws and kidnapers and robbers? During the period of kidnappings we had more kidnappings than we had lynchings. If these Senators were so anxious to give the Federal Government power to bear down on a serious crime, I ask, in the name of common sense and decency, if they thought it was constitutional to do so, why they did not when they had the opportunity include in the Lindbergh kidnapping law the power of the Federal court to prosecute, just as they are trying in this bill to take jurisdiction away from the State courts and give it to the Federal courts.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Will the Senator from Alabama, in the course of his able discussion, be good enough to place in the RECORD a list of all the cases of kidnapping which were purely of an intrastate and not of an interstate character?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the Senator from Colorado is a better statistician than I am. He seems to be more concerned about great crimes than I have been. He seems to be the remedial agent here in Congress, and it certainly seems to me that if he is on the watch tower to detect epidemics of crime of these vile and vicious kinds, long ago he must have compiled the statistics upon this horrible subject of kidnapping.

We have before us the question of the power of Congress to deal with cases of murder, and lynching is nothing but murder. I do not care how able Senators may be in the preparation of a bill, how skillful in its drafting to undertake to evade the Constitution, I do not care how resourceful they are in the matter of defining in some technical way what constitutes a mob, I say to the Senator from Colorado as a lawyer that the same law which applies to three constituting a mob applies to an individual; and, as well pointed out by the Senator from Idaho, we cannot excuse one when we condemn three for the same offense.

It is nothing but a subterfuge to try to inject, by a definition of what constitutes a mob, a Federal power, or to bring a crime under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

When we analyze it, murder is murder, whether it is committed by one or committed by a group. It is the same type of offense. Life is taken. The act is wrong, it is sinful, it is punishable. But in order to raise another Federal question, the Senator proceeds on the theory that three killing a man makes an offense different from one killing a man or two killing a man.

I should like to know why the authors of this bill decided to select the number three. All laws of conspiracy make a conspiracy as offensive, as punishable, whether participated in by two or a hundred. But in this effort to adopt some ingenious rule of construction, the Senators have taken the old Dyer antilynching bill, which originally in the House of Representatives specified five as constituting a mob. It is true that when that bill got to the Senate, in some way, for some reason, somehow, it was decided, "Well, there might not be as many as five in a mob", so the number was reduced in the Senate to three, and the Senators who are the authors of the bill we are discussing have followed on that subject the number contained in the Dyer measure.

I desire to have the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] sent for. I am about to take up a matter, the discussion of which I want the Senator to hear.

I started awhile ago, but I have not had time to finish, being sort of pressed for time, to discuss a phase of the report. I do not know whether the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] wrote the report or not. I will ask him whether he wrote it, or who did write it? I refer to the committee report.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, I did not write it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator know who wrote it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was written no doubt at the request of the committee by its authorized representatives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator mean by members of the committee, or by somebody acting for the committee?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I prefer to have the chairman of the committee speak for the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, the Senator does not know or he is not willing to tell. Which is it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know exactly, and it is not my province to say who wrote the report in its entirety.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to find out whether this is a report written by some professional, somebody not having a direct responsibility by a vote in the committee or in the Senate.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In response I will say to the able Senator that I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Senator must look elsewhere for an answer to his question.

May I state to the Senator from Alabama while I am on my feet that, according to Professor Chadbourn, the State statutes which deal with lynching have various numbers of persons specified as constituting a mob. In at least three States, including the State from which the Senator comes, also in Indiana and Arkansas, one person, it is reported, is sufficient legally for a lynching. In Kentucky the number constituting a mob for the purposes of the statute is three, and apparently in Illinois, New Jersey, and West Virginia the number chosen by the legislators is five.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, it varies from one to five, as I get the point of the Senator.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is my understanding of the statutory situation in the various States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am just wondering by what dogmatic process or arbitrary selection the authors of this bill select three as constituting a mob.

I requested that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] be sent for, and he is now in the Chamber. I wish to discuss at this time, while the Senator is here, what I did not wish to take up in his absence, not because it is personal, because there is nothing personal in it, but for another reason. I will return to the other subject directly, if my time does not expire.

I have been discussing a few different subjects which ought to be included in this program. I have just read in the committee report from the statement by one of the Senator's constituents that the program under the pending bill—

Applies only to persons injured or killed through mob violence on account of race, creed, or color.

There is a fact which all of us knew, but which this man was frank enough to admit.

The point I make is that while we are dealing with the race question we ought to deal with a good many aspects of it in this bill. If Senators hope to pass this bill, there is no reason on earth why its provisions should be limited solely to the colored race.

Mr. WAGNER. Are they so limited?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what the Senator's lawyer says. He did not write the bill, of course; but the statement appears in the committee report, whether or not it is written on the face of the bill. The lawyer who wrote the brief and presented the brief in support of the bill was frank enough to write into his brief that this bill is confined to those who are killed on account of race, color, or creed. I will say to the Senator that I do not think that language is found in the bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well. I am not responsible for any statement by another.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, the man who had been selected by some colored group to prepare a bill on this question submitted an opinion which would be used as the basis and foundation of the legal authorization for the bill. He does not appear as a politician, not as one dependent in any way upon the will and suffrage of the people but he appears as a lawyer. I assume the Senator recognizes that he is a high-type lawyer, standing before the committee as a lawyer, speaking as a lawyer and as an advocate of the bill, in close touch and contact with the sponsors of the bill. I do not mean the authors of the bill. I do not know whether he was in contact with them or not; but he was in contact with all who are promoting this fight, this campaign, this bill. Here is their legal representative, with sufficient manhood and frankness and courage to speak out and put into the written opinion which the committee has adopted and sent to the Senate the statement that the bill is solely one applying to those killed because of race, color, or creed.

I notice that there is not a Republican Senator sitting on the other side of the Chamber—not a single one!

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see why we cannot keep in the Chamber Senators who are interested in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwollenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahay	McAdoo	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Steiner
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Brown	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Bulkley	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	Wheeler
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	White
Clark	Keyes	Pope	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, we have just completed a quorum call, and yet I note there are only two or three Republican Members present on the other side of the Chamber. It is difficult to get those Senators who are supporting the motion of the Senator from Colorado to remain in the Chamber and listen to the discussion. It shows great indifference on their part. I desire to discuss the matter at some length if I can have the time to present it fully.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. A number of Senators have represented to me that they have engagements which they find it necessary to fill. I therefore propose, with the permission of the Senator from Alabama, who has the floor, to ask for a short executive session and following that a recess.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

#### EXHIBIT A

[S. 69, 73d Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to provide for the redistribution of the overbalance of population in industrial centers by aiding in the purchase of subsistence farms, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish in the Interior Department an agency for aiding as herein provided those who desire to acquire and live upon subsistence farms.

Sec. 2. Loans not to exceed \$1,000 to any one person may be made under rules and regulations to be established by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. Preference shall be given applicants for loans who are married or who have dependent families, and who have heretofore engaged in farming and who reside in cities or towns, or who have since January 1, 1931, moved back to a farm.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to appoint local committees to serve without compensation, or to use any agencies, Federal, State, or county, that he may designate to aid in locating suitable farm lands for applicants, and to appraise the value of the lands, to supervise the purchase of building material and the construction of dwellings and other necessary structures, and to supervise the purchase of livestock, farm implements, household equipment, and sufficient supplies to support the applicant and his family until a crop can be produced.

Sec. 5. Title to the land purchased may be taken in the United States, and when so taken the Secretary of the Interior may execute in the name of the United States contracts to convey the land and improvements thereon to the purchaser, his assignee or heirs, upon full compliance by the purchaser with all the requirements of said contract. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make conveyance in the name of the United States when the contract has been fully performed as therein provided.

The Secretary of the Interior may, when the borrower so desires, take a mortgage on said land to secure the loan and interest thereon, and to satisfy the record thereof when the indebtedness secured by the mortgage has been paid in full.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall make rules and regulations for taking liens in favor of the United States upon livestock and farm implements acquired by the borrower and for releasing the same, and/or substituting other security for the loan.

Sec. 7. The interest rate upon said loans shall not exceed 4 percent per annum.

The principal shall be made payable in 20 annual installments beginning 3 years from the date the land is acquired.

Sec. 8. Loans may be made to cooperative associations or to non-dividend corporations organized for the purpose of establishing colonies or groups, or individuals on farms, under regulations to be made by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 9. Preference shall be given, in making loans, to the purchase of lands which have been in continuous actual cultivation and so as to avoid as far as practicable bringing additional lands into cultivation, or expanding agricultural marketable production.

Sec. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make regulations for carrying out the provisions and purposes of this act.

Sec. 11. All the agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this act when requested to do so by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 12. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the Secretary of the Interior out of the funds of the corporation, not to exceed \$400,000,000, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 13. The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the duty, under regulations to be made by him, with the collection of the loans made under the authority of this act, and shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States all moneys so collected by him.

#### (EXHIBIT B)

[S. 1503, 73d Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to provide for the redistribution of the overbalance of population in industrial centers by aiding in the purchase of subsistence homesteads, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish in the Interior Department an agency for aiding as herein provided those who desire to acquire and live upon subsistence farms.

Sec. 2. Loans not to exceed \$1,500 to any one person may be made under rules and regulations to be established by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. Preference shall be given applicants for loans who are married or who have dependent families, and who have heretofore

engaged in farming and who reside in cities or towns, or who have since January 1, 1932, moved back to a farm, or who have lost their farms through mortgage foreclosure or inability to renew or continue their tenancy.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to appoint local committees to serve without compensation, or to use any agencies, Federal, State, or county, that he may designate to aid in locating suitable lands for applicants, and to appraise the value of the lands, to supervise the purchase of building material and the construction of dwellings and other necessary structures, and to supervise the purchase of livestock, farm implements, household equipment, and sufficient supplies to support the applicant and his family until a crop can be produced, and he is further authorized to employ competent and experienced persons to act as superintendents of colonies for the performance of such functions and duties as may be necessary to the establishment and successful operation of the said colonies.

Sec. 5. Land, other property, and any and all rights required in connection with the purposes authorized in this act, may be acquired by the United States through purchase, gift, assignment, or in any other manner, and when so acquired the Secretary of the Interior may execute in the name of the United States contracts to convey the land and improvements thereon to the purchaser, his assignee or heirs, upon full compliance by the purchaser with all the requirements of said contract. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make conveyance in the name of the United States when the contract has been fully performed as therein provided, and he is authorized to provide in each of the said contracts for a conveyance of the land and improvements prior to the full payment of the amount due with respect thereto, on the execution of a mortgage thereon to secure the balance due the United States.

The Secretary of the Interior may, when the purchaser or borrower so desires, convey or cause to be conveyed the land to the borrower and take a mortgage on said land to secure the loan and interest thereon, and to satisfy the record thereof when the indebtedness secured by the mortgage has been paid in full.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall make rules and regulations for taking liens in favor of the United States upon livestock and farm implements acquired by the borrower and for releasing the same, and/or substituting other security for the loan.

Sec. 7. The interest rate upon said loans shall not exceed 4½ percent per annum.

The principal shall be made payable in 28 annual installments beginning 3 years from the date the land is acquired.

Sec. 8. Loans may be made to cooperative associations or to nondividend corporations organized for the purpose of establishing colonies or groups, or individuals on farms, under regulations to be made by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 9. Special effort shall be made to avoid as far as practicable the expansion of agricultural marketability production of crops as to which there is an existing sufficient supply.

Sec. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make regulations for carrying out the provisions and purposes of this act.

Sec. 11. All the agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this act when requested to do so by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 12. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the Secretary of the Interior out of the funds of the Corporation, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for carrying out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 13. The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the duty, under regulations to be made by him, with the collection of the loans made under the authority of this act, and shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States all moneys so collected by him.

Sec. 14. The President may transfer the administration of this act to any other department or agency of the Government.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination in order on the calendar.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John D. Martin, Sr., to be United States district judge, western district of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the calendar.

## RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATION

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of Apr. 15), 1935*

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John D. Martin, Sr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Tennessee.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Nature is speaking today with an insistence that cannot be neglected, and we thank Thee for its promise and beauty that touch us to deeper thoughts and higher feelings. The Lord God is our salvation; we will trust and not be afraid. Blessed Master, enrich us with Thy redeeming and transforming power and direct our pride, our temper, and our ambition. Do Thou take any blindness out of our understanding, any hardness out of our hearts, and any paralysis out of our wills. Fostered by Thy succoring influence and teaching, may we give full proof of our devotion to the cause of good government, plainly manifested by our daily conduct and by our public acts. Thou art the God of our joys, of our sorrows, of our hopes, and a Father of infinite forgiveness that streams from Thy throne of mercy. In our Savior's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## THREE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 94, establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Colony of Connecticut, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman should explain the bill before we let it be passed.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut is now celebrating the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Colony of Connecticut. A commission of the State of Connecticut has been working on the matter. It is of national scope, yet we did not ask financial aid from the Government.

This resolution calls only for the appointment of a Federal commission composed of 5 Senators and 6 Representatives who are to serve without pay.

Mr. SNELL. It is expected, of course, that there will be more or less Federal expense connected with the Government's participation.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. To the extent of \$10,000.

Mr. SNELL. Has this resolution been considered by any committee of the House?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. It has been considered by the Senate, and passed that body unanimously.

Mr. SNELL. But has it been considered by any committee of the House?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. No.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think it is proper practice to seek to pass under unanimous-consent requests resolutions that have not been referred to some committee. On the other

hand, I think it is not only the opportunity of the majority but the responsibility of the majority if they let these resolutions go through in this way.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. There is an abundance of precedent for this.

Mr. SNELL. I do not know of any precedent for it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. The resolution authorizes the expenditure of Federal money. How much is that going to be?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. RICH. Why is not the amount specified in the resolution?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. It is.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if there is no one on the majority side to take the responsibility, I take the responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform us on what subject he wishes to address the House?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am seeking information on the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman intend to give us some information?

Mr. TREADWAY. My endeavor will be to secure some. Mr. KENNEY. The gentleman does not intend to give us some?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think perhaps I can give Members on that side some information, including even the gentleman from New Jersey, but it will not be about a lottery.

Mr. KENNEY. We have the lottery information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. In the RECORD this morning appear three and a half pages of petitions regarding a certain Member's bill for old-age pensions. For weeks the RECORD has been cluttered with these petitions, all mentioning the name of our good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. ROGERS], whom we all like, and against whom I cast no reflection in mentioning this matter. But printing these petitions in the RECORD is costing quite a large sum of money.

The administration's social-security bill has been passed by the House and is now before the Senate. It is a bill which embraces the administration's plan for old-age pensions and is the only kind of old-age-pension bill that will pass this Congress at this session. Hence wasting money printing these petitions incited by a propagandist calling himself "Dr. Pope" should now stop.

Why should the RECORD continue to be encumbered with such costly petitions when they can serve no useful purpose? No member of any committee ever will look at one of them. No one ever reads the notation of them in the RECORD. It is just a useless expense to the Government, and I was wondering whether or not the Committee on Printing could not control the situation and stop such petitions from being printed in the RECORD after a bill covering the subject matter has already been passed by the House when they can serve no useful purpose whatsoever, and are costing the people quite a lot of money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, who is a member of the Committee on Printing, and who usually watches such matters.

Mr. RICH. I took this matter up with the Chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. LAMBETH]. We have taken the matter of entering these petitions up with the Member to whom the gentleman refers, requesting they be kept out of the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ROGERS], whose bill these petitions are espousing, is a good friend of mine, and I would like to do anything I could to help him. I feel sure he has not realized just how much this is costing. I thought perhaps the Committee on Printing could advise him what they are costing and persuade him not to continue putting these petitions in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I took this matter up with the Committee on Printing, and it is my recollection that an understanding was reached that as soon as the security bill passed the gentleman would not then continue to insert these petitions in the RECORD. He has continued the practice, however. I do hope the gentleman from Oklahoma will discontinue the practice.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask what it has cost the Government already to print these petitions?

Mr. RICH. I think it is in the neighborhood of \$10,000; it is too great an amount. It should be stopped.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry I wish to direct to the Chair is whether the Committee on Printing cannot control the matter of inserting such petitions in the RECORD, after a measure passes, when it is clearly apparent the petitions can accomplish no useful purpose?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman understands that the Chair has no right to judge of the sufficiency or propriety of petitions Members may insert in the RECORD; nor, in the opinion of the Chair, does the Committee on Printing have any jurisdiction in the matter. Appeal must be made to the individual Member concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. And control is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair just stated that the Committee on Printing does not have jurisdiction.

Paragraph 1, rule XXII, provides as follows:

Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, endorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof; and said petitions and memorials and bills of a private nature, except such as, in the judgment of the Speaker, are of an obscene or insulting character, shall be entered on the Journal, with the names of the Members presenting them, and the Clerk shall furnish a transcript of such entry to the official reporters of debates for publication in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. If such printing would help our friend from Oklahoma [Mr. ROGERS] or any of his constituents, or the people of the United States, I would not raise my voice against it, but printing them now is so futile and purposeless and costs so much it should stop. It cannot possibly produce any good.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Texas that as a matter of practice there is not the slightest objection to a Member lumping all of the petitions together. Then they would be in the RECORD. But that is up to the Member.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the situation, as I understand it, is this, and I have talked to the members of the Printing Committee: A member files petitions at the desk. On the same day he may file 100 or 200 of them, reading, "The petitioner, John Jones, and others." Each one of those petitions is referred to in the Index. I think the desk itself at the close of the day might lump together the petitions of each Member as to the same subject. There would then be only one reference in the Index or in the RECORD, instead of sometimes 10 pages. I do not see why it cannot be done mechanically by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules no one at the desk has authority to lump the petitions together. It is a matter

either for the House, under the rule which has just been read, or else an appeal must be made to the individual Member. No one at the desk has authority to combine them without the consent of the Member who introduces them. The House, of course, could control the matter.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], I do not want to reflect on our colleague from Oklahoma. He is my friend, as well as the gentleman's friend, and I do not want to say anything against the cause he is advocating, but this man Pope who is securing these petitions is an unpardoned ex-convict. He has spent practically his whole adult life conducting rackets and in jail, and he is about 55 years of age. We had an investigation at one time in this House, which disclosed that this man started out when he was a very young man doing things he should not. He robbed the unemployed and the distressed home owners, and also widows and orphans, on fraudulent oil stocks and in other ways.

The Department of Justice has his picture down here with his convict number across his chest. He has been convicted on 15 or 20 charges of violating criminal laws and is not a stranger in a Federal prison.

Mr. BLANTON. And in some of them down in Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. He is not pardoned now. He is an unpardoned ex-convict. He is not a citizen and does not have the rights of a citizen. If he really wants an old-age-pension law enacted, why did he not appear before the Ways and Means Committee and testify in favor of such a law? He did not ever request an opportunity to testify before this committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Most of these petitions are incited by him on a printed form. I am getting lots of them on these printed forms gotten up by this so-called "Dr. Pope."

Mr. PATMAN. Further, may I say that I filed a complaint against him and went to the Post Office Department and prosecuted the complaint. He came in and admitted the charge and the Post Office Department did not take any further action against the man, because he promised to be good. He said he would not continue to violate the postal laws and regulations, that he would stop; but he turned right around and changed it into another system which is almost as bad, if not as bad, as the one he formerly had.

I say this not in disrespect to our colleague from Oklahoma, WILL ROGERS, or the cause he represents, because I am sure he is honest and sincere. I know he is a capable man. But this Dr. Pope is not a doctor at all and never was a doctor.

Mr. BLANTON. He is a chiropodist.

Mr. PATMAN. He is just one of these self-confessed doctors existing under the laws of Oklahoma where there are no laws in regard to chiropodists. It is just like being an admiral in the Nebraska navy.

The Committee on Labor conducted the Pope investigation. The hearings are printed. These hearings include copies of indictments against Pope, his conviction, and a full exposé of his criminal record.

Mr. BLANTON. I have raised the question, Mr. Speaker, hoping that the Committee on Printing will confer with our colleague from Oklahoma and maybe it will stop.

Mr. RICH. The only way that the Committee on Printing could eliminate this matter that has been criticized here this morning would be to have it considered bulk printing. May I say for the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LAMBETH], that he is doing everything possible to keep the printing in the RECORD to the minimum. It is a question of changing the law unless the Chair, or someone else, could rule that this is bulk printing. Then we could eliminate it.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe our friend from Oklahoma will himself cause it to be stopped.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no authority in the premise; neither has anyone at the desk. The House can amend the rules if it so desires.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEMOCRATIC STEAM ROLLER PREVENTS PUBLICATION OF ARTICLES TO BE  
AFFECTED BY TRADE TREATIES

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democratic steam roller worked overtime, giving the most remarkable exhibition of inconsistent action I have ever seen in the House.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 months ago I introduced three privileged resolutions of inquiry to bring information to this body. Under the rules of the House if a committee sees fit to report adversely on any subject matter it can move to lay such a report on the table. The majority members on the Ways and Means Committee showed that they did not want the information themselves and did not want the House to have any information.

The resolutions which I introduced asked for information as follows: What articles are being considered by three departments of the Government in connection with reciprocal trade treaties? The gentleman representing the Ways and Means Committee moved to lay my resolutions on the table, thus cutting off all debate.

The fact that the Democrats as a body voted in favor of the motion to table these resolutions means that they not only are willing to have our domestic industries destroyed through reductions in our tariff rates but they are willing to do this without even giving the producers and workers affected a fair chance to defend their interests.

LETTER FROM SECRETARY HULL SUPPRESSED

During the meeting in executive session I asked the gentleman whether or not the report from Mr. Hull, Secretary of State, would be read. He said it would. It does not appear in the RECORD this morning and was not read in the House yesterday. That is the only basis on which they turned down the three resolutions which I introduced, and the letter was so weak that they did not even wish to have it read in the House. It did not say a blooming thing or give the least reason whatsoever why the information I asked for in the resolution should not be given to the Members of the House. Now, that is working your steam roller overtime.

The day is not far off when the American people will object to this sort of procedure on the part of their elected and chosen Representatives. It would have been a courtesy to a fellow committee member to have granted me an opportunity to say a few words on these resolutions. I knew perfectly well what the action of the majority would be, but I object most seriously to the manner which was followed.

Now, what explanation did this great Secretary of State make? He said that all the information was submitted in press releases. That is not true. They only give export and import figures. Look at the one that came to your attention this morning saying that the administration intends to negotiate a trade treaty with France. Those interested must submit statements in writing a week beforehand to a committee which has nothing to do with the actual negotiations. It is called the "reciprocal information committee." The actual negotiations are carried on by the committee on trade agreements, and the Secretary himself acknowledged that it was composed of different people at different times, none of whom was ever known to the public.

Is this any way for the representatives of business and industry in this country to have to submit to one committee, which then transmits such parts of this information as they may have a mind to submit to a hidden committee that nobody ever sees or reaches or has any access to whatsoever?

SECRET PROCEEDINGS

They say that I called this a star-chamber procedure. It is worse than that. Not only is it star chamber, absolutely secret, and held behind closed doors, but you do not know who your judges are. The only thing you know is what the verdict is going to be, and that it is going to be in favor of foreign countries. Why should these foreigners have more right to sit around a counsel table and make laws than our own people?

Why should these foreign countries say, "The findings must be submitted to our legislative body before they become operative", while here in this country we are downtrodden

by Democratic dictation and have no say as to the rate or anything else that are to be written into a law under which we are to be governed?

FOREIGNERS HELP WRITE OUR TARIFF LAWS

What would our forefathers have said? Your great Secretary of Agriculture, this man from Iowa, who cannot run his own business successfully, although he inherited a profitable publication, went down to New England and called our people fledglings and weaklings. What would our ancestors who wrote the Declaration of Independence say if today they knew that we simply act here as rubber stamps and have given authority to foreigners to write our laws for us. To throw off the yoke of foreign oppression was the cause of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution. We set up a free and independent government here, but 150 years afterward we pass up our rights and privileges to enact our own laws and allow these foreign representatives the right to sit around the table and do this for us.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the gentlemen on the Democratic side who do not want information to continue this procedure as long as they wish and the American people will resent it in the very near future. "Truth crushed to earth shall rise again", and I will keep repeating these references to star-chamber procedure until it gets home to the people and they realize what mistakes they have made in electing Representatives who do not know their own minds.

Let the Members of this House read the temperate and very argumentative letters submitted by the Senator from Oregon last Friday, describing the methods that these committees pursue. I cannot speak as temperately as he did. I am too impetuous. I want to drive home to the people the mistakes this Congress is making and particularly the mistake it made in enacting this reciprocal-tariff bill, and the need of taking this law off the statute books by repealing it at the very first opportunity.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

NO OPEN AGREEMENTS OPENLY ARRIVED AT

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman referring to open agreements openly arrived at?

Mr. TREADWAY. In contrast, that is as far from this method of procedure as black is from white or light from darkness.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thought that was one of the principles of the Democratic Party, laid down by that great Democrat, Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, that was many years ago, and this is an entirely new type of democracy.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about Tom Jefferson?

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not vote for Woodrow Wilson, but his policies and methods were far superior to those of the present Democratic administration. Today the Democrats are only a little cog in a great big wheel.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that the industry of this country and the labor of this country, who are employed in industry, should know what merchandise we are going to permit to come into this country that will put them out of business?

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course we should, and all we can do is to hear about it afterward. How many thousand articles do you suppose are imported from France? Any man making an article in this country in competition with a similar article that is made in France today must be prepared to submit the whole program to this set-up which is meeting in a dark, secret committee room.

PURPOSE OF RESOLUTIONS

My purpose in introducing these resolutions of inquiry was to enable the Congress, and the industries and workers concerned in the negotiation of these foreign-trade agreements, to know just what tariff items were going to be dealt with. Thus far trade agreements have been entered into with Cuba, Belgium, Brazil, and Haiti, under which our tariff

rates have been reduced on many items without definite prior notice to the domestic industries engaged in their production.

#### DUTIES ALREADY REDUCED ON MANY IMPORTANT ARTICLES

Under the Cuban agreement this country granted rate reductions of up to 50 percent on Cuban sugar, potatoes, lima beans, tomatoes, tobacco, honey, corn, grapefruit, and many other agricultural and industrial commodities. These reductions, under the treaty with Cuba entered into in 1903, were not extended to any other country.

Under the Belgian, Brazilian, and Haitian agreements we have reduced our rates on other commodities, and these reductions have been extended to all other countries without the receipt of any concessions in return. In other words, the reductions made under these latter agreements, and those to be made under future agreements, are in effect general tariff reductions.

In the long list of items on which tariff duties have been reduced are such commodities as cement, plate glass, iron and steel products, canned peas, flax, cordage, linen fabrics, photographic paper, asbestos shingles, laces, manganese, and rum. Many other important products could be mentioned.

Negotiations are now being carried on with some 14 additional countries with a view to making further reciprocal reductions. Included among these 14 countries are such large competing nations as Canada, Italy, France, Switzerland, Finland, the Netherlands, and Spain.

#### PRODUCERS CONCERNED OVER TREATIES NOW BEING NEGOTIATED

The American farmer, the industrialist, and the worker, all are wondering to what extent their livelihood will be jeopardized as a result of these pending negotiations. They would like to know whether the duties on the products which they are engaged in producing will likely be reduced and the domestic market flooded with competing foreign products.

They would like to know whether, in accordance with the suggestion of Secretary Wallace to the New England textile producers, they will have to take up some other line of endeavor. This anxiety is not confined to any one area or section of the country, or to any one group. The dairy farmer, the wheat farmer, the fisherman, and the lumber producer, among others are concerned about the pending Canadian agreement. The watch manufacturers, the textile manufacturers, and others are concerned about the Swiss agreement, and so on down the line.

#### PEOPLE HAVE RIGHT TO KNOW WHAT ITEMS ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. Speaker, our citizens certainly are entitled to this information, and my resolutions proposed to give it to them. At the present time, they are unable to obtain any inkling as to what is going to happen, until a trade agreement has been signed and put into effect. Then it is too late to do anything about it. The time may come when some item will be covered in a trade agreement which a large majority of the Members of Congress would oppose if they had an opportunity, but if the information is not available until a treaty has been signed and put into effect, even the Congress would be powerless to take any steps to prevent such action.

#### INDUSTRIES MUST EXIST IN CONSTANT FEAR

Every domestic industry which is dependent upon tariff protection—agricultural as well as manufacturing—must exist in constant fear that it will be annihilated as a result of one of these trade agreements. As long as the present program is continued, this fear will necessarily continue to exist. Perhaps in many cases it is unjustified, but as long as it exists industries are not going to make any future commitments.

If they could know definitely that they were not going to be affected by negotiations with a given country, it would be very helpful to them and to business in general. On the other hand, if an industry knew definitely that it was threatened with extinction, it could take steps to protect its interests.

#### STAR-CHAMBER METHODS OF NEGOTIATION

When I characterized the negotiation of these trade agreements as star-chamber proceedings, I thought I was using a pretty strong term, but it now develops that it was a little too mild, the views of the gentleman from North Carolina notwithstanding. A gentleman who has had some experience with the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which was set up by the President to hear the complaints of American producers, wrote me the other day that the methods used are actually "worse than star-chamber proceedings." Here is what he had to say:

The Committee on Reciprocity Information is only a buffer. It merely hears the testimony of interested parties and turns it over to the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements without recommendation and without making any findings of fact.

The Committee on Trade Agreements actually decides the amount and extent of the concessions made to foreign countries, but the industry under fire never has the opportunity to directly face these persons who sit as judges in the matter.

In this respect the proceedings are worse than star-chamber proceedings, for in the latter case the accused at least has an opportunity to face his accusers, even though they be prosecutor, judge, and jury combined.

That is a pretty strong indictment, especially coming from a private citizen.

#### PERSONNEL OF TRADE AGREEMENTS COMMITTEE SECRET

Not only is it impossible for domestic producers to make any direct contact with the body which actually carries on the negotiations but they cannot even find out who make up the Committee on Trade Agreements. Their personnel is absolutely secret.

Under date of April 8, 1935, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] wrote to the Secretary of State to find out the names of the members of this committee, but he was informed by the Secretary that the "personnel of the group participating in the actual negotiations varies for each agreement." The Senator's letter and the Secretary's reply may be found on page 6466 of the RECORD for April 26.

#### POWERS OF CONGRESS ABDICATED

When this Government was formed, the people gave to Congress the power to impose tariff duties and to regulate commerce with foreign countries. They have never rescinded that authority, nor have they given permission for it to be delegated to any other body or person. In spite of this fact, this secret and everchanging committee in the State Department, composed of anonymous individuals who are not responsible in any way to the people, has almost complete authority in determining which industries in this country shall continue to exist and which shall be sacrificed to foreign competition in order to obtain some illusory benefit for some domestic export industry. Such a concentration of power is not at all in keeping with the principles upon which this Government was founded. Rather, it is suggestive of certain foreign countries which I could name.

It is hard to believe that constitutional government has so far degenerated in this country that such a secret and irresponsible group should have more power than the Congress of the United States over a matter which is within the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of Congress.

By virtue of the terms of the Reciprocal Tariff Act, Congress does not even have the right to ratify or reject these treaties negotiated by this secret group. No matter how adversely the reductions in duty may affect the interests of our people, neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate has any veto power over them.

While at the President's request the Democratic majority surrendered the power of Congress over the tariff, it is humiliating to note that although the Brazilian and Haitian trade treaties are already effective so far as this country is concerned, they do not become operative until they are ratified by the respective legislative bodies of these countries. As the Representative of one segment of the American people, I am not content to take a back seat in favor of the Brazilian, Haitian, or any other foreign legislative body.

#### MORE OPPORTUNITY FOR GRAFT AND INFLUENCE UNDER PRESENT SYSTEM

It has been alleged by Democratic speakers, including the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] that the

old method of writing tariff laws which has prevailed since the beginning of this Government is conducive to graft and influence. That I most strongly deny. In any event, it occurs to me that so far as these factors are concerned, there is far more opportunity for them under the present system, where tariff making is left in the hands of the secret committee in the State Department to which I have referred, whose work is carried on behind closed doors in company with the representatives of foreign countries anxious to gain a larger foothold in the rich domestic market.

#### PEOPLE CAN TRUST THEIR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

I am sure that the people of this country can safely trust their welfare to their elected Representatives, who are directly responsible to them. We here in Congress have the interests of our people more at heart than the economists, professors, and so-called "experts" who probably make up the Committee on Trade Agreements. Their only interest is to seize every opportunity to put into effect their impractical and idealistic theories, and they regard the people in general in much the same light that a scientist regards a guinea pig.

#### PRESIDENT DOES NOT EXERCISE HIS AUTHORITY HIMSELF

The answer is always made that the power nominally is in the hands of the President, and that he can be trusted to act for the benefit of the people as a whole. If the President conducted the actual negotiations, that might be a good argument, but he has delegated his authority to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State has delegated it to this ever-changing secret committee. The committee, as I have pointed out, exercises the real authority, and the President and the Secretary of State can only give their proposals a very cursory examination. However well-intentioned and theoretically expedient the committee's proposals may appear to be, they may have very serious and far-reaching consequences to American agriculture and industry.

#### PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS IN PROCEDURE

I have already referred to the fact that on April 26 the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] made a very interesting and able address to the other body with reference to the manner in which the trade agreements with foreign countries are negotiated. His remarks are worthy of the careful consideration of every Member of this body. Included therein is a letter which the Senator addressed to the President making certain recommendations respecting proposed changes in the method of negotiating the trade agreements. Among other things the Senator pointed out that the foreign governments have a distinct advantage, in that their representatives are able to deal directly with the group conducting the actual negotiations, whereas domestic producers must deal with a buffer agency.

In substance the Senator proposed the following changes:

First. That interested producers be given access to the agencies which negotiate the foreign-trade agreements in order that they may be on a parity with foreign competitors.

Second. That domestic groups be fully informed concerning the commodities which may be affected.

Third. That they be advised concerning the theories of economic reasoning entertained in the committee on foreign-trade agreements so that they may have an opportunity to show that such theories do not justify a reduction in duties.

Fourth. That domestic producers be given reasonable opportunity to comment upon the evidence in the hands of the committee on foreign-trade agreements on the score of its sufficiency to justify a reduction in duty.

Fifth. That the commodities upon which duties are reduced shall be confined to those included in the lists submitted to American producers.

These suggestions, to my mind, are very commendable. The second, of course, is in harmony with the spirit of the resolutions which I introduced, on which the House voted yesterday. All were flatly rejected by the President in his reply to the Senator from Oregon. The President seemed content to carry on with the present star-chamber methods.

#### FOUGHT ENACTMENT OF RECIPROCAL-TARIFF LAW

I fought the enactment of the reciprocal-tariff law, under which these trade agreements are being negotiated, even before the original bill was introduced in Congress. I opposed it in the Ways and Means Committee and I opposed it on the floor. Knowing that the overwhelming Democratic majority in the House would grant the President the authority which he asked, I sought to so amend the bill as to protect the interests of our people. I endeavored, without success, to provide that no rate should be reduced below the difference in foreign and domestic costs of production. I endeavored, without success, to provide that full and complete hearings should be held on all proposed agreements. I endeavored, without success, to require that the trade agreements, when negotiated, should not become operative until approved by the Senate and House of Representatives. The Democratic majority mowed down all these amendments, and completely surrendered the power of Congress over the tariff to the President, who has, in turn, surrendered it to others.

#### DEMOCRATS MUST TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR REFUSING INFORMATION

If I could have my way—and in this respect I am sure I speak the sentiments of virtually every Republican, and possibly many Democrats—I would repeal the reciprocal-tariff law altogether. I have introduced a bill for that purpose, but with a Democratic President in the White House it could never be enacted into law. Failing in that, I would like to see the present star-chamber method of negotiating these agreements radically changed. However, as even this seems impossible to obtain, in view of the expressed satisfaction of the President and the Secretary of State with the present system, it seemed to me that the next best thing to do was to try and get as much information as possible with respect to items being dealt with. Now that even this proposal has been turned down, the only recourse for the people is through the polls.

In view of the fact that all power under the Constitution in relation to the tariff and foreign commerce resides in the Congress, the House certainly should have felt itself entitled to know how these trade agreements are being negotiated and what items are being dealt with. Moreover, since these trade agreements in the very nature of things affect the livelihood of large groups of our people and the economic welfare of the whole country, the House should have felt duty bound to seek this information and make it public.

The home market is the birthright of our own people. They are entitled to the first chance to produce the goods consumed in that market. Their birthright should not be bargained away by secret, star-chamber negotiations with foreign countries. The Democratic Party is going to have to shoulder the full responsibility not only for the enactment of this nefarious law but for the way it is being administered and for refusing to make the details of the negotiations a matter of public record.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 10 minutes to reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it would be a good thing if the gentleman would wait until tomorrow to make his reply.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I hope my friend will not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to submit his request now. It is a matter that is up to the gentleman from Arkansas. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. RICH. I shall not object.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the procedure yesterday on the resolution offered by my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] was in the regular ordinary course. It was contemplated that the report of the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, would be printed in the Record, but inasmuch as it was inadvertently omitted by the Clerk, I am sure unanimous consent will be obtained to include it in today's Record.

My distinguished friend and colleague on the Ways and Means Committee the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.

TREADWAY] sought to gain political advantage and have an opportunity to make a tariff speech. For many years the tariff has been the dividing line between the Democrats and Republicans, but we hear very little of it today and will hear less in the future. Although we Democrats have had an overwhelming majority in Congress for the last 2 years we have not attempted to change this tariff law for the reason it would do no good under existing conditions.

In 1929 we witnessed the most prosperous year America has ever known. In the spring of that same year, at a special session of Congress, an overwhelmingly Republican majority passed the most damnable, outrageous, and high protective tariff the world has ever known. [Applause.]

During the consideration of that measure 48 of the greatest nations of the world protested against the passage of such a law, and declared if it were enacted they would retaliate, and after its enactment and in retaliation every one of those nations passed a high protective tariff against American products, even higher than we had ever considered in this country. In addition thereto, they allowed American products a quota and placed an embargo against our agricultural products. In other language, they passed tariff and other laws which had the force and effect of barring our goods in foreign ports.

The farmers of America produce a great surplus and it is necessary that this surplus must be sold on foreign soil in order to obtain a decent livable price for the products consumed in America. Being unable to sell in foreign markets, the surplus products accumulated in this country and sold for less than cost of production. The farmer had no money to pay taxes or interest or to buy the necessities of life. They could not buy from the retail merchants, the retail merchants could not buy from the wholesalers, the wholesalers could not buy from the manufacturers, and the manufacturers were forced to close their doors. As a result, bankruptcy stared the Nation in the face, industry closed its doors and turned its men out of employment, banks failed, stocks and bonds were reduced to practically no value, wiping out the fortunes and savings of millions of Americans, thus bread and soup lines were formed in all the great cities of this Nation. All of this occurred in less than a year, due to the enactment of the Smoot-Grundy high protective-tariff law, and brought starvation, suffering, and distress to the American people and bankruptcy to industry. This Republican high protective tariff which was sought for the protection of the few big moneyed interests, as against the welfare of the American citizens, was the moving cause, and did more to bring about the panic through which we are passing than all the other causes combined. [Applause.]

I am surprised that any Republican would have the affront in the American Congress to defend or advocate this tariff law.

Since its enactment the Tariff Commission has been given authority to raise or lower the tariff on any article 50 percent, but that has done us no good because the nations of the world still have their hands raised against us and are still seeking to punish us as a retaliation for the way we sought to treat them by this high tariff.

Since the Democrats have been in control of Congress we passed a law, which the gentleman from Massachusetts is now complaining about, which gave to the Secretary of State the right to negotiate reciprocal-tariff treaties with foreign nations with a view that the foreign nation would reduce its tariff, eliminate its embargo and quota and allow great quantities of American farm products to be sold in the markets of that nation. We have no foreign ports where we can sell our surplus farm products, and we are simply endeavoring to deal, in a friendly way, with these foreign nations who are commercially our enemies. We do not dare to pass a reduced-tariff law because the foreign nations would dump their goods in this country and at the same time refuse our products and goods in their ports. All that we can possibly do is to work through a Federal agency, such as we are doing through the Secretary of State, with a view of entering into friendly agreements with the various nations by treaties, more or less in a secret way, whereby

they will permit us to sell our goods and products in their country.

Two years ago when American wheat was selling from 19 to 30 cents per bushel in this country, wheat was selling in France for \$1.54 per bushel. We could have shipped our wheat to France, paid their high tariff, disposed of our surplus wheat crop, and received a high price, but we were stopped because of a quota applied to our American farm products, because of an embargo against our goods, and because France, like other nations of the world, had made up their minds that they would teach the American people that they could not bar all the products of other nations in this country and at the same time sell their products and goods in an open port in foreign countries. Prior to the passage of this tariff law in 1929 England was a free-trade country, and we shipped our goods to English ports without paying a tariff, but England, like France and other nations, in retaliation, has practically barred our products from that country. America is the greatest creditor nation in the world, and it is a well-known fact that we cannot live unto ourselves. At the same time it is generally conceded by all Americans that we should have a reasonable tariff on foreign goods to equalize the difference in labor.

It appears to me it comes with poor grace for the distinguished ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee to chastize the Democrats or to even raise his voice in approval of this unreasonable tariff which has been the prime factor in bringing about this financial panic and depression. [Applause.] For the first time in the history of the country, due to Republican misrule and high tariff laws, thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children have been fed from the Public Treasury, and when we seek a cause of what brought about this debacle, this destruction of American industry, this prostration of agriculture, and the sufferings and hunger of the American people, we find the prime cause to be this Republican tariff, of which my Massachusetts friend is so fond. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

#### DISTINGUISHED SOUTHERNERS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Mr. John E. Edgerton, at the Southern States Industrial Council, yesterday evening, in the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. If the Democratic Members of the House feel that all these speeches should go into the RECORD, I do not feel that we should continue to object to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following opening address of President John E. Edgerton at dinner to distinguished southerners by Southern States Industrial Council, New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday evening, April 29, 1935:

Distinguished guests and fellow southerners, if there be detected in this rather stereotyped salutation, or in my subsequent words of welcome, any lack of the usual southern warmth, I beg you to attribute it to my cautious avoidance of an indiscretion like that for which a stern judge once rebuked a clever lawyer. Arising to make his plea, and observing that the jury was composed of both sexes and were predominantly of his own religious faith, the lawyer fervently addressed them as, "My dearly beloved brothers and sisters of the righteous and mighty jury." Whereupon, of course, the presiding jurist warned him not to try so obviously to tamper with the jury's affections.

In one of his proverbs, as recorded in the book of all the ages and the "best seller" of the entire Christian era, King Solomon beautifully says that "words fitly spoken are like apples of gold in pictures of silver." Having in his own household 700 major and 300 minor competitors in the use of words, that kingly gentleman of wide experience ought to have known what he was talking about. Never, I think, have I presided over a gathering of any sort which so much as this inspired my aspirations to the perfection of speech indicated in the quoted proverb. Yet I realize that should I speak with such eloquence as to even suggest the

shining qualities of gold and silver, I would probably be criticized by some radically conservative liberal reactionary for the injudicious raising of the monetary issue on a social occasion. These are cynical times, indeed. He is heedless of all portents and indifferent to all hazards who now pronounces a eulogy except over the dead, or passes a compliment except upon the generous hand that feeds him. On the other hand, criticism and counsel, particularly from the best qualified sources, are only the illegitimate offspring of unenlightened selfishness, and all men are hypocrites except the judge and those who share his views. It is now largely a battle of epithets, and he who can call the other fellow the most charmingly ugly names without reference to the soundness, sense, or sequence of his arguments emerges the hero of the conflict. Let him who courts the applause of the rabble learn only how to impart with his voice or pen the highest degree of repulsiveness to such terms as "propagandist", "special interest", "radical", or "conservative" and he will not go unrewarded. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the fears of the timid, who shrink from the suggested temptations of unaccustomed association and flee from contacts and information which might embarrass their predetermined courses.

But my proudly cordial nature compels me to risk the bold assurance to you, our esteemed guests of honor, that the Southern States Industrial Council feels genuinely grateful to the genius of your understanding for the high privilege of voluntarily and cheerfully sharing with you the wealth of our undisguised but innocuous hospitality and good fellowship. Recognizing this to be a wealth-sharing age, from the exactions of which none can escape, we are to the extent at least of the cost of this philanthropic gesture reducing the burden of legislative responsibility. Lest, however, our very unselfishness be misunderstood, or mistaken for a sort of uncanny prescience, I want now, with all the constitutional authority of my position, strictly interpreted, to exempt our guests from every unholy obligation that may seem to be suggested by our self-sacrificing exercise of the human right to a few hours of harmless association with a distinguished group of our own public employees. I solemnly promise that no sense of mastership which may have been left to us shall be permitted to disturb the fraternal spirit of this coming together of Jeffersonian equals. If our congressional employees who are present should wish to take advantage of this occasion and of section 7 (a) to bargain with us collectively for higher wages and shorter hours, they may feel perfectly free to do so without reference to either their or our understanding of the section by which such right is vouchsafed. Our only condition is that if you thus approach us collectively, you must be looking for a bargain and not for the opportunity or privilege of doing more for what you are getting or of getting less for what you are doing; for such radical departure from custom would probably get both you and us "fired" for heresy from the lodge of the Mystic Knights of the Sea.

In other words, fellow Americans from south of that line which Bob Taylor called "the imaginary line between cold light bread and hot biscuits", we want every male guest present to feel like he is a king. I know, of course, all about the democratic aversion to titles of nobility. But that was when we had no great emergency to justify such idiosyncrasies. Furthermore, we might as well begin now practicing the feeling of kingship which promises soon to be a permanent actuality. Certainly our distinguished lady guests, already queens, require no wand of graciousness to induce the regal sense. But let me admonish you kings that even a queen may not have for her companion in sovereignty more than one king.

Perhaps it has already become apparent to you that by these preliminary remarks I am trying primarily to clear the way for others more able than I to satisfy your intellectual appetites. It seems to me, therefore, that because of the rather unusual character of this occasion some additional assurances are required for your complete understanding and ease. However strong suspicions to the contrary may be, this dinner to our southern compatriots is an enterprise of good will. It was conceived in the spirit of the largest helpfulness and born of an unpretentious desire to further the ends of constructive endeavor. It is meant to promote a broader and clearer mutual understanding of the problems which belong to our entire citizenship, and even more particularly to reenergize the genius of enlightened cooperation among those who have the largest responsibility for the proper solution of these problems. It happens that in this period of national emergency the South again occupies a peculiar position of responsibility. To those of us in whom religious instincts and the pride of ancestry cooperate with the faculties of understanding it appears providential that during every great period of national emergency throughout American history a man or a few men born of the womb of the South and steeped in its traditions have been in the positions of leadership which dominated our common destiny.

The initial emergency linked with our national history was that of wresting our liberties from the tyrannical hand of a German King occupying an English throne. The genius and patriot who led in that bloody but successful enterprise was a southerner, George Washington. The next great emergency was that of building out of the wreckage of a revolutionary war the American Union and of trying to make forever secure against the aggressions of tyranny the blood-bought liberties for which our fathers had laid down their lives. Over the extraordinary assemblage of master minds which came together in the City of Brotherly Love for the purpose of writing an instrument of government that would stand through all the ages against the recurring tides of economic change and popular passion the same peerless southerner, George Washington, presided. That was the first, and undoubtedly the greatest, "brain trust" that ever came together on this continent for any

purpose. That occasion also witnessed the silencing of, perhaps, the only unalloyed politician in the Constitutional Convention, who, by the way, appears also to have been the only Socialist present. When he suggested at a point in the proceedings that something be put in the Constitution that would particularly appeal to popular sentiment, the statesman, Washington, answered quite extemporaneously from the chair, "If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise standards to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

Obedient to the guiding spirit of the God upon whom those matchless nation builders daily called, those standards were raised, and to them the wise and honest ever since have been repairing for their inspiration and political guidance. It is a matter of common knowledge that although Thomas Jefferson was not present on that historical occasion it was largely his political genius working through the sympathetic, capable hand of Madison that dominated its incomparable outcome. Thus, to the leadership of the three most revered of southerners—Washington, Jefferson, Madison—does the Nation owe not only its life but the principles of government which have so far been sufficient for all of the emergencies to which its erring citizens have fallen unhappy heir.

Then, I need only to remind you that through the emergency of 1812 to 1815 it was the same southerner—James Madison—who was at the helm of state; and who, supported by that dauntless other southerner—Andrew Jackson—saved again our threatened liberties; and through those emergency periods of 1829 to 1837 and from 1849 to 1853 we came triumphantly over all military and economic difficulties under the leadership of Jackson and Polk. But the most serious of the emergencies since the birth of the Nation came in the early sixties when the Union itself was standing its severest tests, brought on chiefly by agitators of the type now observed in ominous numbers throughout the country, including the District of Columbia. I have always thought that God Almighty particularly saw to it that a man of southern birth, breeding, and habits of mind and soul was in the White House during those dreadful years of fratricidal strife to so overbalance the forces of conflict as to save to Christian civilization its greatest asset—the American Union. Following this devastating emergency was that of the reconstruction period, from which the Nation would have recovered more quickly, perhaps, if that other great southerner—Andrew Johnson—could have been supplemented in his efforts by other southerners, and if less energy and money could have been expended on reform and more on recovery.

As a result of this misguided policy of trying, through political castigations, to anticipate the natural laws of reform and progress, the prostrate South required the rest of the century to scramble to its feet. How much wiser it would seem to have been to restore the patient first so that he could help in reforming himself! But there were academicians and agitators in those days which made such employment of common sense and practical experience apparently impossible.

The next national emergency was world-wide in its scope. Before it had run its bloody course, it had removed from the productive processes of society approximately 50,000,000 of human lives and had destroyed something like \$400,000,000,000 of property. During that period of 5 years the steady hand and courageous heart of another great southerner of treasured memory, Woodrow Wilson, guided our ship of state successfully through the turbulent waters of an unprecedented deluge of trouble. As a matter of fact, our Nation was born in an emergency, and through these 140 years of its youthful indiscretions, it has been largely nurtured by emergencies. So, there is little that is either new or strange in the one with which we are now at grips. But this is the only one of appreciable proportions for which the South did not supply the redeemer. However, it should be noted that when our present dynamic leader became fully conscious of his impending responsibilities, being a well-informed student of history, he immediately established residence in a Southern State, and has often admitted himself that he always feels stronger for his tasks when he returns from even a short visit to his home among the Georgia pines and "crackers." But even if Providence, in our latest emergency, turned elsewhere than to the South for the chief burden-bearer of executive leadership. He appears to have recognized that the task of lifting our Nation out of the present slough of economic despond and restoring it to what Harding called "normalcy" was going to require on Capitol Hill a legislative leadership equally as capable, courageous, and strong as that which characterizes the executive end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Not only was such leadership provided out of southern materials in the persons of Garner, Byrns, Robinson, Bankhead, and others too numerous to mention in a crowded program, but to further fortify our Government, our liberties, and our Christian civilization against the incursions of hostile forces not indigenous to our soil, the South was called upon to send to the battle front its Hull, its Roper, and its Swanson; a couple of its stalwart Davises, its Jones, its Tate, its Webb, its Clay Williams, its own Mrs. McMillin, and a host of others of its great. Then by sheer force of good habit Virginia sent along from its own famous cupboard its very finest Glass. And what a debt the Nation in general, and the South in particular, owe to Virginia for its superlative contributions of dependable statesmanship throughout our history, and particularly during the great emergencies.

So, my friends, we of the home guard have come all the way to Washington to tell you that the South is proud of you, her own. We do not come as "pink tea lobbyists" or as propagandists of "special interests." It is true that we have a special interest, and

at this time that special interest is to help you in every reasonable, practical, patriotic way to do your full duty to our common country, and we conceive that you can do that in no better way than by upholding the traditions of our section for its unswerving devotion to American principles and institutions. We do not come in any arrogant, sectional spirit, to boast of our virtues, or to embarrass you with any requests for special favors.

We do not come to instruct you how you shall vote on any measure, nor as to the position you shall take on any question. We have no threats of reprisal to make. We come as friends, as joint heirs of common traditions and responsibilities, and as fellow citizens seeking the best welfare of our country. If there be criticism, advice, suggestion, or disappointing references during our contact with you on this occasion, none of it will be invidious or intended as other than constructive. God forbid that the time shall ever come when decent Americans of whatever class or group may not sit down together, in public or in private, and discuss any matter they wish without being held up to public scorn by demagogues, charlatans, or marplots. We feel that it is not only our right but our duty to give our representatives in government any information or opinion which we think will be helpful to them in the discharge of their obligations. These are the reasons, and the only reasons, why we are here, and we are glad to believe that we are understood by you.

Among your hosts of the Southern States Industrial Council, there are perhaps as many different shades of political thought and opinion as to what our country's present plight calls for as there are in Congress itself outside any in that body who are more devoted to the philosophies and doctrines of Karl Marx, Lenin, and their apostles, than they are to those of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and others of similar mind and character whose names adorn American history. But it is the question of fundamentals about which we have a common concern—and at this point there should not be any irreconcilable differences among good Americans.

We of the rank and file in the South do not believe that there is anything of such unusual character in this latest emergency as to justify or call for deliberate contraventions or circumventions of the American Constitution or other radical departures from established customs in treating extraordinary conditions. We cannot reconcile so-called "planned economies" to our peculiar system of government. In the first place, we don't know what a "planned economy" is, and nobody has explained it. We recognize it to be an academic term that seems to imply a mysterious program, entrancing in its suggestions, but which is to reveal its full meaning as it unfolds in execution. It has a sort of foreign suggestion that does not appeal naturally to most Anglo-Saxon minds. It seems to suggest that citizens cannot safely or wisely plan for themselves, and that their Government must lift the burden from their shoulders. It appears to connote more bureaus, more dipping into private affairs by Government, and more regulation of the individual lives of citizens by experts even after all emergencies have passed. No one has more convincingly pointed out the dangers in a so-called "planned economy" than did Mr. Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York.

In a very remarkable address delivered on March 2, 1930, on the subject of States Rights, Governor Roosevelt used this striking language: "The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'master minds' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find 'master minds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand—such a government might be to the interests of the country. But there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history."

Wise words, indeed, and are undoubtedly as true now as they were just 5 years ago after our economic tailspin had started. In fact, I have never read a more excellent enunciation and defense of the fundamental principles of our Government, particularly those touching self-government for States, minority rights, home rule, and Federal power, than are contained in this notable address. If I were a Member of Congress, I believe I should want to saturate myself with its superb thought and use it as a guide in the determination of my attitude on the questions presented.

But there are one or two other vital questions about which the South is particularly concerned in these troublous times. Our section constitutes the largest area within the borders of the United States in which practically all of the people are of one blood, of one language, of one God, and of one basic philosophy of life. Whether ours is the best blood, the best language, the only God, and the soundest basic philosophy is a matter which others have a granted right to and may dispute. We think they are, and so strongly do we think it that we are not willing to trade any of them. That does not mean that we will not at all times welcome into our midst any others of whatever race or creed who come with peace in their hearts and high purpose in their souls to help us with the self-compensating tasks that belong to a free and progressive people. We are not willing, however, to trade moral and spiritual values for mere economics. If relatively lower economic standards, with which we are now so often twitted, are ever to be made higher at the price of lower moral and spiritual standards or ideals of loyalty to distinctly American institutions, then we spurn the trade. Actually we have been reminded so often that we are a sort of wayward, uncultivated, and undernourished child who needs a guardian and ought to be adopted

as a ward by the Government, that many of us have gotten to believing it and are joining in the chorus. Missionaries of communistic and socialistic philosophy have been sent to us from Russia and even from the most alien parts of our own country to tell us how unprogressive we are. In the lexicon of these emissaries of class hatred, whom we are asked to recognize as the authoritative medium of contact with our own employees, all employees are bourbons, slave drivers, and exploiters; while the only friends of the workingman are those who would teach him the methods of the mob. Social experts have swarmed in upon us to tell us how backward we are and how old-fashioned and out-of-date it is to be drinking water, going to church, working, praying, and actually liking anybody who has more than we have.

Stories of starving millions, of ignorance, penury, and squalor have been brought to Washington and published abroad as justification for the application of new and strange remedies. Flying squadrons of discord bearing torches of hate and distrust have come among us while some of our own executive authorities have sat spineless and acquiescent in planned procedures of lawlessness wherein the right of free men to work for their living has been effectively challenged. These are some of the things to which the best intelligence and the heart of the South do not and will never assent. The overwhelming masses of both the employing and employed elements of our people are of one mind and spirit on these vital questions. They are friends and want to remain friends. They recoil from suggestions of any sort of so-called "standardization or regimentation" which does or would substitute hate for love, animosity for amity, distrust for trust, war for peace. If I know, as I believe I do, the blood, the spirit, and the temper of these homogeneous, peace-loving Americans, they will never consciously sell their birthright for a mess of any kind of pottage.

And we don't want to be anybody's ward or pet. We don't want an advantage of any sort to which our natural conditions and endowments do not entitle us. If we are to be reformed, we want the reformers to be first informed. We also suggest conformity with the sound Jeffersonian principle of "equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none." At another place in that admirable address of Mr. Roosevelt, to which I have previously referred, he said: "Let us remember that from the very beginning, differences in climate, soil, conditions, habits, and modes of living in States separated by thousands of miles rendered it necessary to give the fullest individual latitude to the individual States." We insist now that when any program of standardization or system of codification be undertaken through any sort of legislation or Executive action, this fact be not only remembered but that it be intelligently and fairly observed. In peculiar ways, as I have tried to suggest, the young industrial South is patently "on the spot."

The most vital of all the questions with which the leadership of our section is confronted today are: Shall it abandon its dreams of an industrial development commensurate with its extraordinary possibilities and resign itself to a relapse into a predominantly agricultural status? If so, then what are the crops suitable to our soil which are to quickly take the place of its present major production, premiership in the cultivation and manufacture of which appears to be passing so rapidly to other nations? If not, then is the leadership in our industrial development to be political in character and under the control of the Government or under private leadership and with private capital appropriately encouraged and supervised by Government? Regardless of all statistical indications of a refreshing revival in business now apparent, and of all optimistic forecasts based upon these reports, charts, and tables, these and corollary questions of a fundamental character will have to be answered quite definitely, in our opinion, before industrial production in the South or elsewhere can confidently and profitably proceed. And if it doesn't proceed profitably, it will not proceed long. We would say, if we were asked, that such questions cannot be correctly or wisely answered in hasty obedience to threats from any source. They cannot be answered at all by political profiteers in social discontent. Strongly organized minorities seeking through processes of intimidation and bluster to further their own diabolical ends cannot even contribute appreciably to rational answers. Such questions are only for cool-headed, clear-headed, patient, courageous statesmen who know the difference between facts and fancies, between sound and substance; who are ever willing to stake their political fortunes upon the conscientious performance of their constitutional functions; and who think always in terms of the greatest good to the largest number of all the people.

Clearly the legislative end of this gigantic responsibility rests largely upon the sturdy shoulders of our southern representation in the Congress. Certainly no shoulders ever carried a heavier burden, and it is one that obviously cannot be honorably transferred to other shoulders. The South looks particularly to you, our distinguished servants in Government, not only to uphold the traditions of your section for wise and courageous leadership on occasions of emergency and to protect it from forces that would destroy its peaceful relationships, but to supply the Nation with new and more stimulating evidences of constructive thought and action. We are a people of much faith—in God, in the church, in our American Constitution, and in you, our own flesh and blood. We have come here to tell you so. We have good reason to believe that in all that we have said or will say we speak the thought and the feelings of the overwhelming masses of our people in the South. And in praying the blessings of Almighty God upon you in the faithful, happy performance of your respective duties, we are asking Him to help you not to let the American taxpayer become the most forgotten of men.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech delivered this morning before the United States Chamber of Commerce by Mr. Forney Johnston, one of the greatest Democrats of the South.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Forney Johnston. Is there objection?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. An agreement was entered into at the beginning of this session that these things should not go into the RECORD and cumber it up. For the present I object.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why did not the gentleman object to the request made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It was up to the gentlemen on the Republican side to do that.

Mr. KNUTSON. We thank the gentleman for his unbiased attitude and his nonpartisanship.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## CONFERENCE REPORT—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. KNUTSON. You are not going to do much business today.

The SPEAKER (after counting). One hundred and sixty-five Members are present. Not a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Bankhead	Doutrich	Lesinski	Schulte
Beam	Ellenbogen	Lewis, Md.	Shannon
Berlin	Fernandez	McLeod	Sisson
Bland	Fulmer	McReynolds	Smith, Wash.
Bolton	Gambrell	McSwain	Snyder
Brown, Mich.	Gasque	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Caldwell	Gehrman	Martin, Mass.	Starnes
Cannon, Wis.	Gingery	Meeks	Sumners, Tex.
Carden	Goodwin	Montague	Sweeney
Cartwright	Granfield	O'Malley	Thomas
Casey	Griswold	Palmisano	Thurston
Chapman	Guyer	Parks	Tobey
Christianson	Hartley	Patton	Tolan
Clark, Idaho	Higgins, Conn.	Peyser	Underwood
Cochran	Higgins, Mass.	Quinn	Wadsworth
Cole, Md.	Imhoff	Rogers, N. H.	Weaver
Connery	Kennedy, Md.	Ryan	Wilson, La.
Cooley	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sabath	Wilson, Pa.
Cravens	Kerr	Sanders, Tex.	Withrow
Culkin	Lamneck	Sandlin	Wolfenden
DeRouen	Lee, Okla.	Schuetz	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-seven Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a quorum present. There is important business before the House, and I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. There has just been a roll call.

Mr. KNUTSON. But there is no quorum present, and I want the RECORD to show it.

The SPEAKER. The roll call developed 347 Members present. A quorum is present.

## CONFERENCE REPORT—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 23, 43, 46, 48, 51, 53, 58, 60, 62, and 63.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "219,000, of which \$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$471,910"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$144,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$458,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,285,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$632,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$185,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,970,311"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 5, and 38.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

B. M. JACOBSEN,

JED JOHNSON,

M. A. ZIONCHECK,

J. G. SCRUGHAM,

W. P. LAMBERTSON,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,

KENNETH MCKELLAR,

ELMER THOMAS,

FREDERICK STEIWER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6223) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference as to each of such amendments, namely:

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

On amendments nos. 2 and 4: Provides for a First Assistant Secretary and an Assistant Secretary, as proposed by the Senate, instead of two Assistant Secretaries, as proposed by the House.

On amendments nos. 6 and 7, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates \$50,000 for the National Park Service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$35,000, as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$65,000 for the Bureau of Mines instead of \$45,000, as proposed by the House, and \$85,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 8: Makes immediately available \$20,000 of the appropriation for the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

## GENERAL LAND OFFICE

On amendment no. 9: Appropriates \$700,000 for surveying public lands, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$470,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 10: Appropriates \$80,000 for salaries and commissions of registers of land offices, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$73,000, as proposed by the House.

## BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

On amendment no. 11: Appropriates \$471,910 for salaries in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, instead of \$474,790, as proposed by the Senate, and \$470,290, as proposed by the House, the increase over the House figure being for one additional stenographer at \$1,620.

On amendment no. 12: Appropriates \$144,200 for agency buildings, instead of \$140,400, as proposed by the House, and \$145,000, as proposed by the Senate, in providing a new position of mechanical engineer at \$3,800.

On amendment no. 13: Appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, for the expenses of organizing Indian-chartered corporations.

On amendments nos. 14 and 15: Authorizes the expenditure of \$290,000 of applicable appropriations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$275,000, as proposed by the House, for the maintenance and operation of motor- and horse-drawn vehicles; and authorizes the expenditure of \$160,000 of applicable appropriations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

On amendment no. 16: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the unexpended balances of tribal funds being continued available for various purposes for the Tesuque Pueblo shall be available also for the purchase of equipment.

On amendments nos. 17, 18, and 19, relating to the purchase of land for Indians under the Wheeler-Howard Act: Appropriates \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House; makes \$15,000 of this sum available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, in lieu of \$22,500, as proposed by the Senate; and prohibits the expenditure of any part of the appropriation for the acquisition of lands outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations in the States of Arizona and Wyoming, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 20: Appropriates from tribal funds \$9,153.20 for payment to the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Missouri, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 21 and 22: Appropriates \$170,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, for expenses incidental to the sale of timber, and makes \$20,000 available for such purpose during the fiscal year 1935, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 23: Appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest fires.

On amendment no. 24: Appropriates \$116,000 from the funds of several tribes of Indians, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of homes, purchase of seed, etc., for such Indians.

On amendment no. 25: Appropriates \$311,452, as proposed by the Senate, for final payment of the Indians' share of the cost of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District's irrigation, drainage, and flood-control project.

On amendments nos. 26 and 27: Appropriates \$24,000, as proposed by the Senate, for enlarging the hospital (including the purchase of equipment) at the Sequoyah Orphan Training School near Tahlequah, Okla.

On amendment no. 28, relating to the Chemawa School, Salem, Oreg.: Consolidates the item for general repairs and improvements into one sum (\$60,000) and makes such sum available for improvements to the heating system and shop facilities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of requiring that \$40,000 of such sum be available only for improvements to the heating system, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 29: Corrects a total.

On amendments nos. 30, 31, and 32, relating to appropriations from tribal funds for the support of Indians in the State of

Arizona: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$24,000, as proposed by the House, for the Fort Apache Indians; appropriates \$55,800 for the San Carlos Indians, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$65,800, as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of the sum which is appropriated for such Indians.

On amendment no. 33: Appropriates from tribal funds \$61,500 for the Keshena Indians, of Wisconsin, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 34: Corrects a total.

On amendment no. 35: Provides for salaries of the governor and mining trustee as heretofore paid, in connection with expenses of tribal officers of the Five Civilized Tribes, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 36 and 37, relating to traveling and other expenses of tribal councils: Appropriates from tribal funds \$50,000, of which amount \$10,000 is made immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the House; and limits the per diem to a maximum of \$6 and for a period not longer than 30 days unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of the Interior, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 39: Corrects a date.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

On amendment no. 40: Inserts the word "and", as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of the phrase "and/or", as proposed by the House.

## GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

On amendment no. 41: Appropriates \$450,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$335,000, as proposed by the House, for geologic surveys.

On amendments nos. 42 and 43: Appropriates \$70,000 for continuation of the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska, in lieu of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$40,000, as proposed by the House; and limits the sum available for personal services in the District of Columbia to \$20,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 44 and 45: Appropriates \$650,000 for gaging streams, in lieu of \$617,000, as proposed by the House, and \$767,000, as proposed by the Senate; and makes available for co-operative work with the States or municipalities \$458,000, in lieu of \$425,000, as proposed by the House, and \$575,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 46: Appropriates \$200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the enforcement of the provisions of certain mineral leasing acts.

On amendment no. 47: Corrects a total.

## BUREAU OF MINES

On amendments nos. 48 and 49: Appropriates \$632,000 for operating mine rescue cars and stations and investigation of mine accidents, in lieu of \$499,000, as proposed by the House, and \$669,000, as proposed by the Senate, the reduction of \$37,000 in the Senate figure being accounted for by the elimination of \$27,000 for repair and operation of two mine-rescue cars and \$10,000 for mine accident statistics. Eighty thousand dollars is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 50 and 51: Appropriates \$185,400 for testing fuel, instead of \$210,400, as proposed by the Senate, and \$110,400, as proposed by the House, the reduction of \$25,000 in the Senate figure being applied to a proposed increase of \$50,000 for research in connection with the composition and properties of American coals. For personal services in the District of Columbia, \$27,600 is made available, as proposed by the House, instead of \$32,600, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 52, 53, and 54: Appropriates \$288,860 for mineral mining investigations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$128,860, as proposed by the House; makes \$18,800 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, in lieu of \$23,800, as proposed by the Senate; and not to exceed \$12,000 is made available for the purchase, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$2,500, as proposed by the House.

On amendments nos. 55, 56, 57, and 58, relating to oil and gas investigations: Appropriates \$237,866, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$122,866, as proposed by the House; provides \$6,000 for the purchase, repair, and operation of automobiles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House; makes \$40,000 of the appropriation immediately available, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not to exceed \$17,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of \$22,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 59 and 60, relating to mining experiment stations: Appropriates \$195,450, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$145,450, as proposed by the House; and provides that not to exceed \$13,140 may be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of \$18,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 61: Appropriates \$87,690, as proposed by the Senate, for care and maintenance of buildings and grounds at Pittsburgh and Bruceton, Pa., in lieu of \$67,690, as proposed by the House.

On amendments nos. 62 and 63, relating to the economics of mineral industries: Appropriates \$262,855, as proposed by the House, instead of \$275,855, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that not to exceed \$210,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$233,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 64: Inserts the word "and", as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of the phrase "and/or", as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 65: Corrects a total.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

On amendment no. 66: Appropriates \$62,600, of which \$5,000 shall be immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$57,600, as proposed by the House, for the Crater Lake National Park.

On amendment no. 67: Appropriates \$500 for the erection of a marker to commemorate the battle at Big Dry Wash, Ariz., during the Indian wars, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 68: Appropriates \$432,900, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and general expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1935.

On amendment no. 69: Appropriates \$47,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses, public buildings outside the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1935.

#### TERRITORY OF ALASKA

On amendments nos. 70 and 71: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the establishment and maintenance of public schools, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the House.

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

Amendments nos. 1 and 3: Providing for the establishment of the position of Under Secretary of the Interior at \$10,000 per annum.

Amendment no. 5: Relating to the appropriations for the Division of Grazing Control.

Amendment no. 38: Relating to an audit of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

B. M. JACOBSEN,

JED JOHNSON,

M. A. ZIONCHECK,

J. G. SCRUGHAM,

W. P. LAMBERTSON,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. KNUTSON)—ayes 145, noes 26.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that some Members did not rise at all on the last vote, and the Chair is entitled to count.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is counting. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-seven Members are present; not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 67, answered "present" 1, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

#### YEAS—273

Adair	Clark, Idaho	Duffy, N. Y.	Greever
Arnold	Coffee	Duncan	Gregory
Ashbrook	Colden	Dunn, Miss.	Hamlin
Ayers	Colmer	Dunn, Pa.	Hancock, N. C.
Bacharach	Cooper, Tenn.	Eagle	Harlan
Barden	Corning	Eckert	Hart
Beiter	Costello	Edmiston	Harter
Bell	Cox	Elcher	Healey
Biermann	Crosby	Evans	Hennings
Binderup	Cross, Tex.	Faddis	Hildebrandt
Bland	Crosser, Ohio	Farley	Hill, Ala.
Blanton	Crowe	Ferguson	Hill, Knute
Boehne	Cullen	Flesinger	Hill, Samuel B.
Boileau	Cummings	Fitzpatrick	Hobbs
Boland	Daly	Flannagan	Hoeppel
Boylan	Darden	Fletcher	Hope
Brennan	Dear	Ford, Calif.	Houston
Brewster	Deen	Ford, Miss.	Huddleston
Brown, Ga.	Delaney	Fuller	Igoe
Brunner	Dempsey	Fulmer	Jacobsen
Buchanan	Dickstein	Gasque	Jenckes, Ind.
Buck	Dies	Gassaway	Johnson, Okla.
Buckler, Minn.	Dietrich	Gavagan	Johnson, Tex.
Burnham	Dingell	Gehrmann	Johnson, W. Va.
Caldwell	Disney	Gifford	Jones
Carpenter	Ditter	Gilchrist	Kee
Carter	Dobbins	Gildea	Keller
Cary	Dockweiler	Gillette	Kelly
Castellow	Dorsey	Goldsborough	Kenney
Celler	Doughton	Gray, Ind.	Kerr
Chandler	Doxey	Gray, Pa.	Kleberg
Chapman	Driscoll	Green	Kloeb
Citron	Driver	Greenway	Kniffin
Clalborne	Duffey, Ohio	Greenwood	Knutson

Kocialkowski	Merritt, N. Y.	Rayburn	Sumners, Tex.
Kopplemann	Mitchell, Ill.	Reece	Sutphin
Kramer	Mitchell, Tenn.	Richards	Sweeney
Kvale	Monaghan	Richardson	Tarver
Lambertson	Montet	Robertson	Taylor, Colo.
Lambeth	Moran	Robinson, Utah	Taylor, S. C.
Lanham	Moritz	Romjue	Taylor, Tenn.
Larrabee	Mott	Rudd	Terry
Lea, Calif.	Murdock	Russell	Thom
Lemke	Nelson	Sadowski	Thompson
Lewis, Colo.	Nichols	Sanders, La.	Tonry
Lloyd	Norton	Sanders, Tex.	Truax
Luckey	O'Brien	Sandlin	Turner
Ludlow	O'Connell	Sauthoff	Umstead
Lundeen	O'Connor	Schaefer	Utterback
McAndrews	O'Day	Schulte	Vinson, Ga.
McClellan	O'Leary	Scott	Vinson, Ky.
McCormack	Oliver	Scrugham	Wallgren
McFarlane	O'Neal	Sears	Walter
McGehee	Owen	Secrest	Warren
McGrath	Parks	Shanley	Wearin
McGroarty	Parsons	Sirovich	Welch
McKeough	Patman	Smith, Conn.	Werner
McLaughlin	Patterson	Smith, Va.	Whelchel
McMillan	Pearson	Smith, Wash.	White
Mahon	Peterson, Fla.	Smith, W. Va.	Whittington
Maloney	Peterson, Ga.	Snyder	Wigglesworth
Mansfield	Pettengill	South	Wilcox
Martin, Colo.	Pfeiffer	Spence	Williams
Mason	Pierce	Stack	Wolverton
Massingale	Rabaut	Steagall	Wood
Maverick	Ramsay	Stefan	Woodrum
May	Ramspeck	Stubbs	Young
Mead	Randolph	Sullivan	Zioncheck
Meeks			

#### NAYS—67

Allen	Dirksen	Kahn	Reed, Ill.
Andresen	Dondero	Kimball	Reed, N. Y.
Andrew, Mass.	Eaton	Kinzer	Rich
Andrews, N. Y.	Ekwall	Lehlbach	Robison, Ky.
Arends	Engel	Lord	Rogers, Mass.
Bacon	Fenerty	McLean	Seger
Blackney	Focht	McLeod	Short
Bolton	Gearhart	Maas	Snell
Buckbee	Gwynne	Mapes	Stewart
Cavicchola	Halleck	Marshall	Taber
Church	Hancock, N. Y.	Merritt, Conn.	Tinkham
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Michener	Treadway
Collins	Hoffman	Millard	Turpin
Cooper, Ohio	Hollister	Pittenger	Wilson, Pa.
Cravens	Holmes	Plumley	Wolcott
Crowther	Hull	Powers	Wolfenden
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Ransley	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amalie

#### NOT VOTING—90

Bankhead	Crawford	Kennedy, N. Y.	Ryan
Beam	Culkin	Lamneck	Sabath
Berlin	DeRouen	Lee, Okla.	Schneider
Bloom	Doutrich	Lesinski	Schuetz
Brooks	Drewry	Lewis, Md.	Shannon
Brown, Mich.	Ellenbogen	Lucas	Sisson
Buckley, N. Y.	Englebright	McReynolds	Somers, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Fernandez	McSwain	Starnes
Burch	Fish	Marcantonio	Thomas
Burdick	Frey	Martin, Mass.	Thomason
Cannon, Mo.	Gambrill	Miller	Thurston
Cannon, Wis.	Gingery	Montague	Tobey
Carden	Goodwin	O'Malley	Tolan
Carlson	Granfield	Palmisano	Underwood
Carmichael	Griswold	Patton	Wadsworth
Cartwright	Guyer	Perkins	Weaver
Casey	Haines	Peyser	West
Christianson	Hartley	Polk	Wilson, La.
Clark, N. C.	Higgins, Conn.	Quinn	Withrow
Cochran	Higgins, Mass.	Rankin	Woodruff
Cole, Md.	Hook	Relly	Zimmerman
Connery	Imhoff	Rogers, N. H.	
Cooley	Kennedy, Md.	Rogers, Okla.	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Granfield with Mr. Wadsworth.  
 Mr. Rankin with Mr. Guyer.  
 Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Doutrich.  
 Mr. Bloom with Mr. Goodwin.  
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Perkins.  
 Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Thomas.  
 Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Christianson.  
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Burdick.  
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Hartley.  
 Mr. Connery with Mr. Englebright.  
 Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Carlson.  
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.  
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Thurston.  
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Woodruff.  
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Tobey.  
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Withrow.  
 Mr. Wilson of Louisiana with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Church.  
 Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Schneider.  
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Marcantonio.  
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Carden.  
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. O'Malley.  
 Mr. Patton with Mr. Frey.  
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Reilly.  
 Mr. Quinn with Mr. DeRouen.  
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Gambrill.  
 Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Brown of Michigan.  
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Ellenbogen.  
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Schuetz.  
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Sisson.  
 Mr. Starnes with Mr. Ginery.  
 Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Hook.  
 Mr. Thomason with Mr. Tolan.  
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Kennedy of Maryland.  
 Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Underwood.  
 Mr. West with Mr. Polk.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under Secretary (which position is hereby established in the Department of the Interior, with compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum and with appointment thereto by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate).

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments no. 1 and no. 3 may be considered together, as they relate to the same matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendment no. 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment no. 3: Strike out "\$421,590" and insert in lieu thereof "\$431,590."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments no. 1 and no. 3 and concur in the same.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the amendment creating the office of Under Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Can we afford it at this time?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have an explanation of these amendments before we act on them.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, is not the majority leader going to make a statement in support of his motion?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I can do that, Mr. Speaker, but I extended the courtesy first of yielding time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SNELL. I think it would be better if the gentleman from Colorado first gave us an explanation of the item.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendments nos. 1 and 3 provide for the creation of the office of Under Secretary of the Interior Department, at a salary of \$10,000 a year. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and for this reason requires a vote of the House. We have four Under Secretaryships in other departments at the present time—in the Department of Agriculture, created last year; in the Department of State, created in 1920; in the Department of the Treasury, created in 1921; and in the Department of War, created in 1920. In the latter case the office is under another name, but it carries the same salary and the duties of an Under Secretary. The first three of those Under Secretaryships were created in exactly the same method we are pursuing in the present instance, by amendments on appropriation bills. In the War Department the office was established by the act of June 4, 1920 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 182). So there is nothing out of the ordinary procedure of the House, or of Congress in creating this office in this way. This provision was recommended by the Budget, it was approved by the President, it was regularly sent to Congress and was included in this appropriation bill by this

subcommittee and approved by the main committee, and reported to the House.

When the item was reached for consideration on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it was legislation on an appropriation bill. I conceded the point of order, and it necessarily went out of the bill. When the bill went to the Senate, that body inserted and adopted this provision by a vote showing a substantial majority, and it now comes back to us in this form.

Under the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], I stated to the House that the House would be given an opportunity to vote upon this amendment when the conference report was brought up, and that is what is before us at the present time.

The reason the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Interior Department, the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House, and the Senate itself, have all approved of the creation of this Under Secretaryship is because of the enormous amount of work that has been heaped upon the Secretary of the Interior, especially during the past 2 years. Within that time something like 30 major activities have been added to the Interior Department. If you will pardon a personal reference, I have for many years before and ever since I came to Congress had personal knowledge of the activities of the Department of the Interior, and during the past 15 years that I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee I have been quite familiar with the work of all the various departments of the Government. I say to you deliberately that I believe no department of our Government needs an Under Secretaryship as much as the Interior Department. This has been true for many years, but within the past 2 years so many new activities have been added to that Department that it has become imperatively necessary that the Secretary of the Interior have an additional assistant. I will mention some of them.

The Bureau of Mines was taken away from the Department of Commerce and put under the Department of the Interior. The Federal Board for Vocational Education has recently been added to the Interior Department.

The administration of the grazing upon the public domain, designated the "Taylor Grazing Act", is put under the control of this Department. That law will have a far-reaching effect upon the conservation and orderly use ultimately of about 175,000,000 acres of land. The President has added to the Interior Department the administration of practically nearly all of the public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, which in itself entails an enormous amount of work, as you all know. The Executive has added to this Department the administration of a very large number of public buildings and grounds throughout the entire country, other than the District of Columbia. The Division of Territories and Insular Possessions, including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the other insular possessions of our country; 11 national military parks; 2 new national parks; also 10 battlefield sites of the United States and transferred for administration from the War Department to the Interior Department. As I say, all these activities have been taken from other departments and transferred to the Interior Department during the past 2 years. Ten national monuments have been added, 11 miscellaneous memorials, and 11 national cemeteries, including Gettysburg, and many others transferred from the War Department or other departments and their administration put upon the Secretary of the Interior.

The national monuments have been taken from the Agricultural Department.

Mr. Speaker, this marvelously large number of very important activities has been recently transferred from the control of the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments, and put under the supervision of the Interior Department. We Members from the West believe they have been transferred to this Department for more coordinated and better administration than they had under

the other departments. I may mention many others, such as the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Mount Rushmore Memorial Commission, the United States Geographic Board, the Subsistence Homesteads, and various other things.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is today the hardest worked public official under the American flag. The present Secretary of the Interior works nights, holidays, and Sundays. He has had no vacation since he took office. He goes to his office at 8 o'clock in the morning and stays there until 6 or half after in the evening; goes home to dinner and goes back to his office at 8 o'clock and works until 11 o'clock at night. Aside from the President, there is no other official under our flag who has as great responsibilities heaped upon him as the Secretary of the Interior. This tremendous amount of imperative work of the highest importance makes it absolutely necessary to give him this additional assistant. It is necessary in fairness to him and in the interest of efficient work. It is physically impossible for him and his present assistants to carry on all that work as fully and carefully as it should be. The Secretary is also the Administrator of Public Works and also Petroleum Administrator.

My colleagues, why is it President Roosevelt assigns all of these gigantic responsibilities to Harold L. Ickes? It is because he knows and the American people know that this Secretary of the Interior is honest. They know he has the ability, the courage, and the energy to splendidly manage all these monumental tasks.

Secretary Ickes has spent \$2,000,000,000 during the past 2 years, and not a single dollar of it was ever misapplied by him, and he will expend \$4,000,000,000 during the next 2 years, and not a dollar of it will ever be misapplied by him.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23 of this year I referred to the work of Secretary Ickes at some length. He has a record that every American ought to be proud of. Every loyal son and daughter of Uncle Sam feels that our country is the greatest nation on this planet. We all believe that the entire world is every day looking toward our country to see what we are doing. Considering the tragically unsettled and ominous conditions of nearly all the other countries, we firmly believe that our country is not only the leading nation, but that our country is the hope of the human race on this planet. If our ship of state weathers the present financial storm, the others may survive. Our country has the greatest task before it that we have had since the Civil War. The destiny of the United States depends very largely upon the work of this Congress and the way the laws we pass are administered and the way the money we appropriate is expended, and, aside from the President, Harold L. Ickes will probably have more to do with the success or failure of that historic and monumental task than any other human being.

For that reason I feel that Congress, the board of directors of this Government, should, as I know you will, gladly uphold his hands. I have not the slightest idea who will be appointed Under Secretary. But, whoever he is, he will have to be the caliber of individual to be approved by the Senate. He has to be affirmed by the United States Senate. I feel we can trust the Senate to see that there is a suitable person appointed to fill this position.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I realize in view of the thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of new Federal positions that have been created in the past 26 months, that from one point of view the addition of one more office may not appear to be a very important matter. It does seem to me, however, that when it comes to a question of providing for a new Under Secretary in one of the great departments of this Government, with higher standing and greater remuneration than any Assistant Secretary in the Government, the matter is of sufficient importance to warrant a thorough investigation into the facts, preferably by a legislative com-

mittee of this House, before we are called upon to approve such a request as is before us at this time.

What are the facts? There has been practically no evidence at all submitted, either to the House committee or the Senate committee, to justify the creation of this office. You will find the testimony before the House committee comprised in a single page of the hearings. At the time we endeavored to get more information with reference to the assignment of duties under the present set-up, as well as those contemplated under the new set-up. We were advised by letter from the Department that it was not in a position to give us this information. The testimony before the Senate committee is about two pages in length. I believe there was not a single word of discussion on the floor of the Senate when the amendment providing for the new office was adopted.

The sum and substance of the justification submitted is embodied in two short paragraphs in the statement of Secretary Ickes to the Senate committee. In those paragraphs he states two things: First, as the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, has just pointed out, that certain new activities have been turned over to the Department of the Interior; and second, that he has been a very busy man lately, that he has given up Saturday afternoons and holidays and that he would be glad to have additional help.

What are the additional activities referred to? The chairman of the subcommittee has mentioned a few of them. The Bureau of Mines has been returned to the Department where it used to be. Puerto Rico has been added to the Territories supervised by the Department. A small administrative organization has been set up under the Taylor grazing-control bill. Most of the so-called "additional activities", however, seem to be represented in the maintenance and upkeep of Federal buildings in the District and elsewhere, of national monuments, cemeteries, and parks which have been grouped together and placed in the Department of the Interior. You will find the list in the Senate hearings. No mention is made of those activities which have been taken away from this Department and placed elsewhere, such as the Pension Bureau, formerly a tremendously important activity in the Interior Department, now under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

Secretary Ickes has been, of course, an extremely busy man. We all appreciate this fact. He has had his work as P. W. A. Administrator; he has had his work as Oil Administrator. A recent newspaper states that he has had no less than 12 separate titles under the present administration. Much of his time has necessarily been devoted to duties outside the Interior Department. This statement goes also, I am told, for one of the Assistant Secretaries in the Interior Department. Perhaps additional help is needed in his emergency activities. I should suppose the new organization under the work-relief bill would be helpful. I find nothing, however, in the evidence submitted to the House or Senate which establishes, to my mind, in and of itself the need of an Under Secretary in the Interior Department.

I realize fully the importance of the work of this Department. I should be the last to wish to handicap that work in any way. The Interior Department, however, is not one of the larger departments in this Government. If you measure it in terms of annual appropriation, if you measure it in terms of the number of workers on the rolls of the several departments, you will find that in each case the Department of the Interior stands no. 6 in the list of the 10 departments of this Government.

As compared with the Interior Department, with a personnel of less than 33,000 and an appropriation of some \$61,000,000, the Navy Department, second on the list of departments, to take one example, has a personnel of over 150,000 and an appropriation of over \$450,000,000. Instead of an Under Secretary, a First Assistant Secretary, and an Assistant Secretary, the Navy Department operates with a single Assistant Secretary.

Until about a year ago, Mr. Speaker, we have never had an Under Secretary in any department of the Government ex-

cept two. We have had one for years in the State Department, the work of which touches every important center on the face of the globe.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We have had one for years in the Treasury Department, the work of which vitally affects everyone in the Nation. We have never had any other Under Secretary in any department until about a year ago when a third Under Secretary was provided for in the Department of Agriculture after considerable controversy at the other end of the Capitol, the position being created in order to give increased recognition and increased remuneration to the present Under Secretary of Agriculture, Professor Tugwell.

It seems to me that before we go ahead and create another position of this importance, the matter ought to be gone into thoroughly. It ought to be gone into not only from the point of view of the needs of the Interior Department, but from the point of view of the precedent it will create with respect to other departments, from the point of view of fairness to those departments and to other assistant secretaries in the departments.

For these reasons, in the light of the existing evidence or lack of it, I shall vote in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Colorado to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman should call the attention of the House to the fact that the Pension Bureau, which is probably as large as all of these other bureaus that have been placed in the Interior Department in the last 2 years, has been taken away from that Department and transferred to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have endeavored to emphasize that fact. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address myself for a few minutes to the work of the Department of the Interior and the record that it is making under the capable direction of Secretary Harold L. Ickes.

In the 2 years since he has been a member of the Cabinet, Secretary Ickes, through hard work, boundless energy, and courageous and intelligent leadership has wrought a miracle in this once too easy-going Department of the Government. By industry and perseverance, two of his outstanding qualities, Secretary Ickes has reorganized and revitalized the Department of the Interior so that today it really has come into its own.

It is true that Secretary Ickes has been subjected to criticism. Name me a man in public life who is worth his salt who has not been unjustly arraigned for doing his plain duty. Name me a man who in the past 2 years could have carried the heavy burdens and who could have tackled the multitudinous and complex problems with more ability, distinction, and devotion to public service than Secretary Ickes. If he exists, I do not know him.

With the many regular and emergency duties that have devolved upon the present Secretary of the Interior, he is, without doubt, the busiest and hardest-working official in Washington. He is up with the sun and toils far into the night. He loves work and seems to thrive on it, and yet there is a limit to human endurance. The Secretary himself does not complain, but in all fairness we should provide him with an Under Secretary to afford him some small measure of relief from the arduous labors that now encompass him.

The Department of the Interior has grown with the country. Its various bureaus and divisions are among the most important in the Federal structure. Not content to operate his Department in mere routine fashion, the present Secre-

tary has taken on more and more work—work which he knows, and we know, should have been done in the past.

Secretary Ickes stands as a giant at the head of the conservation movement in this country. He hates extravagance and waste. His every act since assuming office has been in the interest of protecting the vast natural resources of our Nation. He believes that the real wealth of America is something more than dollars. He knows that the real wealth of this country is its soil, its water, forests, and minerals. He has devoted his Department to the furtherance of that program.

Let me recount a few of the accomplishments of Secretary Ickes in this direction. Appalled by the ever-recurring loss of good topsoil in the western country, he organized and put into operation the Soil Erosion Service. He also has set up within the Department of the Interior a Division of Grazing as a first step toward saving the rapidly disappearing public range. As Oil Administrator he has fought with vigor and, I might add, some success against the shameful waste of an irreplaceable commodity. As Chairman of the National Resources Board, he has formulated a long-range plan for the orderly development of all natural resources for the benefit of the many rather than for the few.

Secretary Ickes' record as Public Works Administrator has been no less notable. Without an organization and without precedent to guide him, he tackled the biggest peace-time spending job in the history of the world. This, gentlemen, was a thankless task and one bound to bring him grief. But to his everlasting credit let it be said that he has not deviated one whit from the course upon which he set out. Sometime early in his life he learned the meaning of the word "no." That he has not forgotten, and I, for one, hope he never forgets.

Secretary Ickes' loyalty to the administration cannot be questioned. No matter what others may say, he enjoys the full confidence of the President of the United States. Only last week President Roosevelt again demonstrated his good sense by selecting the Secretary as chairman of the works-allocation committee to advise with the President as to allocation of funds under the works-relief resolution we passed.

Mr. Ickes is a strong man. He is a real asset to this administration. Let us give him this Under Secretary. I know of no Cabinet officer more in need of one. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Washington the major activity of the Interior Department was the Pension Bureau. The Pension Bureau involved an expenditure at that time of something like \$330,000,000 or \$340,000,000, if I remember correctly. If my recollection is correct, at that time there was one Assistant Secretary. Subsequently, and before the advent of the Veterans' Administration, an additional Assistant Secretary was provided. When the activities of the Department were cut down more than one-half, the additional Assistant Secretary was not taken away.

Two Assistant Secretaries should easily be able to take care of all the activities that are crowded into this Department. Every single one of the activities that has been turned over to this Department is headed by an experienced manager who has had charge of such activities for years or who has been trained in such matters for years. They were more or less minor activities in the departments or bureaus in which they were stationed.

It is true that these other matters have been put under the Secretary. It is true that, perhaps, there are more activities there than when he took it over, but not more than the burden which a Secretary and two assistants should carry. There is not half the burden there was when the Pension Bureau was in the Department, with a tremendous number of appeals going to the Assistant Secretaries and to the Secretary, just as they go now to the head of the Veterans' Administration. Of course, there were more pensions at that time, because we had a tremendous number of Civil War veterans living.

There is nothing in the hearings in connection with this item that would justify it. Secretary Ickes did say that he

loved his work and that he got there early and worked late. I believe he told the truth, but he does not tell us out and out that in order to do his work and do it right he must have this Under Secretary. Why should we give a man something that he does not justify? Why should we go ahead and establish more jobs at this time when no real reason is presented to us why we should do it? If the work of the Interior Department is to be turned over to an Assistant Secretary and Mr. Ickes is going to deal himself entirely with out-Department activities, this is not a reason why we should have an Under Secretary, but a reason why we should have a different Secretary. Mr. Ickes should be put at the head of these out-Department activities. It does not go well at all to come here and create another new and permanent position, from which we will never get away, in order to provide just one more great, big job.

I hope the Congress will consider this matter on its merits and will vote against the establishment of the office of Under Secretary of the Interior.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, no doubt most of my colleagues know that I do not favor the creation of new positions and I never favor them unless I think they are absolutely essential in the efficient administration of the public service.

This is one instance where I think an Under Secretary is essential for the efficient administration of the Interior Department and the allied duties conferred upon the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Why does the American Congress persist in calling this position Under Secretary, a distinctly British term?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The office of Under Secretary has been created and is supposed to have a little greater authority than an Assistant Secretary and to compensate for this authority a greater salary is provided. The salary is \$10,000, whereas the Assistant Secretaries receive from \$8,000 to \$9,000.

Let me go into the merits of this case. I endorse what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has said, and I endorse what the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] has said, but I want to make this further statement. At this time it is absolutely essential to create this position if we are to have an efficient administration. Listen to me a minute. The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the duty, under this \$4,000,000,000 measure, of making loans of every character, as well as the investigation of such loans, to States, municipalities, and public bodies. He is now charged with this duty and you may say it is outside of the Secretary's office. Maybe so, but he is charged with the duty and he has got to give it most scrupulous attention and investigation. In addition to this he has been made the Chairman of the Board of Allotment, upon whose shoulders fall the allotment of every cent of the \$4,000,000,000 appropriation for works relief.

Can you expect him, can you expect any man, no matter how great or how strong he may be, to stand up under all these duties and perform them efficiently? Therefore I think it is absolutely essential that he should have an Under Secretary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do we have Under Secretaries in other departments?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have an Under Secretary in the Department of Agriculture, created by Congress just as this is created. We have an Under Secretary in the State Department, created by Congress just as this is being created.

The State Department is far smaller than the Department of the Interior and has a smaller appropriation. The State Department has an appropriation of \$14,000,000, and this

Department has an appropriation of sixty-one or sixty-two million.

The Treasury Department has an Under Secretary, the War Department has an Under Secretary.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. TRUAX. Did not the gentleman from Texas assure us at one time that Mr. Ickes would have nothing to do with the \$4,000,000,000 that we have lately appropriated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I did not; I assured the Congress, and I still assure it, that Mr. Ickes would not act on the final allotment of the \$4,000,000,000 appropriation, that in every instance the President of the United States would do it. [Applause.]

Mr. TRUAX. That may be, but does not the gentleman think that Mr. Ickes should devote all of his time to his duties and not so much to ascertaining men who favor the share-the-wealth proposition?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is for the gentleman himself to answer in his own time; I am on the other side of the fence.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The statement has been made that the War Department has an Under Secretary. In the interest of accuracy, is it not a fact that while he has a salary of \$10,000 he is an Assistant Secretary, and that we have no Under Secretary in the War Department?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is just a difference in name. The Assistant Secretary of War performs the same duties as an Under Secretary and gets the salary of an Under Secretary. What is in the name?

Now, in conclusion, let me say this. You may not agree with me, but some time ago I did not think so much of Mr. Ickes, but since then I have made a careful investigation of his duties and the amount of work that he is doing. I now say that I have every confidence in his sincerity and integrity. He has administered the appropriation of \$3,000,000,000, and no man that I have ever heard has ever charged one word against his integrity or his honesty or his sincerity in doing everything for the best interest of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the Commission of Fine Arts has been placed under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. I do not know whether any of you Members have noticed what is going on in the beautiful park, the historic park west of the Capitol.

If you will take the time to go out on the plaza of the Capitol and look toward the Washington Monument you will see that a beautiful park has been converted into almost a barren waste. That park contained trees that have stood there for three-quarters of a century, some of them for a century. Many of the trees destroyed were the rarest specimens to be found in any capital city in the world. Trees stood there under which Lincoln and other notable statesmen have walked. That park has been the joy and inspiration of literally countless millions of people who have come here, and yet the Fine Arts Commission, I understand, has been responsible for cutting down these beautiful trees, rooting them out, and sawing them into cordwood. I feel it is an indefensible act, and that Congress ought to have prevented it. Most of the damage has been done. How many more trees the Commission plans to take out of the Botanic Garden or to take out even of the Capitol Park no one knows. I think this House should take an interest in the situation and not allow the Commission to run riot and destroy what it has taken nature a century or more to produce.

That is all I want to say on the subject. I rose to bring the matter to the attention of the House, because it is a piece of vandalism that is absolutely inexcusable. As I say, they have made a beautiful spot into almost a barren waste. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report presented by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. I believe my colleagues who have served with me for a number of years cannot find anything in my record to justify the conclusion that I am in favor of extravagance or waste of public money. I am sure that this proposition should not be settled along partisan lines, although it sometimes appears that nothing can be offered by this administration which will suit some gentlemen on the opposite side of the Chamber. Of course, however, they are entitled to their opinion.

So far as the Secretary of the Interior is concerned, he is a man of outstanding ability, and is capable of holding the very responsible position the duties of which have been intrusted to him. No man in the Government today has greater responsibility, save and except only the President of the United States, than has Secretary Ickes. In addition to all his vast, multitudinous duties which he had prior to the time Congress authorized the expenditure of \$4,880,000,000 for relief, he has had additional duties assigned to him and is to a large extent responsible for the expenditure of this large amount of money. No one knows better, in fact no one knows as well, what he needs in the way of assistants to help him carry these tremendous burdens than does the Secretary himself. I feel that after we have authorized the expenditure of this colossal sum of money it would be a very narrow policy, very unwise for us to cripple the man responsible for the expenditure of that money and not give him the assistance he needs for the efficient discharge of his public duties. I trust, my friends, especially on the majority side of the House, have enough confidence in this administration and in the Secretary of the Interior to take his word for his needs with respect to the discharge of his public responsibilities, and I think nothing could be more short-sighted, nothing could be more unjustified than to say that Secretary Ickes is not capable of and cannot be trusted to say what assistance he needs in carrying these tremendous burdens. When this amendment comes to a vote, I hope those on the majority side, and also on the minority side, will show their confidence in the man at the head of this great Department and give him the facilities that he says are essential to faithfully and efficiently discharge his duties in a way that will be satisfactory to all. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me I shall endeavor to answer my good friend from New York [Mr. REED]. He complains about the trees being destroyed and about the condition of the land at the foot of Capitol Park, about its being all torn up, and so forth. To those Members who have just come to Congress I would call attention to the fact that for many years we had the choicest collection of dumps on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue that the world has ever known. We had fortune tellers, gypsy headquarters, crystal-gazers, one-arm lunch rooms, and various other decorative and artistic establishments. When a visitor came to the city of Washington, if he had any esthetic sense at all, he was humiliated to think that in the Nation's Capital we should have such an aggregation of eyesores.

What has been done? A broad, comprehensive plan to rearrange the entire lay-out of streets and roads at the foot of the Capitol has been adopted. An extension of the park so that it will be practically coterminous with what were the boundaries of the old Botanic Garden is provided for. No one loves trees more than I do, or regretted to see their passing more than I did, yet I know that in order to make a more beautiful Washington we must make some temporary sacrifices.

Let me say again to the House that when all this plan is complete we will have there an improvement that will far

outshadow the old conditions that existed prior to this rearrangement.

Now, about this question of the appointment of an Under Secretary to the Secretary of the Interior: We all know that it is not a question of the \$10,000 involved in the creation of a new place. That is not the issue. None of us can be camouflaged by that. In fact, the time consumed in discussing this conference report and the printing of the RECORD may cost as much as the salary we are going to allot to this new officer. That is not the question. The question is whether or not you are going to stand behind your President. You have just voted him an appropriation of approximately \$5,000,000,000 to break the distress jam in which we find ourselves. Now you are told to tie his hands so that he cannot carry out and distribute that vast appropriation that is going to result in the uptrend of affairs in our country and to bring us back again from out of the depths of despair to the bright land of hope and prosperity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Now, if you engage a carpenter to do a job, you are going to give him the tools with which to do the work. You are not going to tie his hands and say, "Go ahead and do it without tools." If the President is going to do a good job he needs the right kind of tools. He needs the right kind of help and assistance. This is one of the things he wants. As has been explained here today, he alone will have the final say in the allotment of this vast fund, but he must have intelligent and understanding help and cooperation or he will fail. Our dear friends on the Republican side would like to tie the hands of the President. They are peering cautiously out of their cyclone cellars to see if the storm has passed. Many of you perhaps did not get approval of all the projects that you favored. I did not myself, but I yield any personal animus I might have for the good of the country, for the good of all. You took an oath to support the Constitution and not to work for your own State alone but for the entire country. The President wants this help and this assistance this appointment will give him. He needs it. You have given him the money. Now give him the tools to satisfactorily discharge the heavy responsibility and obligation that you have placed upon his shoulders. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I recall very well when I first came to Washington each side of Pennsylvania Avenue was filled with crystal-gazers, but there are no more crystal-gazers down there now. They have all been taken over by the new deal. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. McLEAN. Does the gentleman recall the time when there was a sign extended out in front of one of those buildings on one side of which it read, "First chance" and on the other side, "Last chance"?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. That is now the slogan of the new deal.

Now, the gentleman has dwelt eloquently upon the need for this new position. When I first came here we only had one Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Now there are two, and you want to create a third one. You call him "Under Secretary", I suppose, so that it will not hurt the feelings of the taxpayers so much; but whether you call him "Under Secretary" or "Assistant Secretary", he is a superfluity. I can assure you there are no more crystal-gazers available for this position if you create it, because you now have them all on the Government pay roll. [Laughter.]

The money that is carried in this bill does not become available until July 1, 1936, and we have been assured by "grand headquarters" that the \$5,000,000,000 we recently appropriated will be spent before that time. Of course, we naturally expect it will be spent before the next election.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. This money becomes available the 1st of July 1935.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all concerned about this Assistant Secretary of the Interior from the viewpoint of the crystal-gazers or the parks in Washington. I am concerned about the necessary help from the Secretary of the Interior for the good that he may do for the United States as a whole. I am concerned about the internal affairs of this Nation and the welfare of our citizens.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] dwelt at length on the lack of testimony showing the necessity of a position of this kind. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman and his colleagues to the fact that it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper today which does not testify to the necessity for help in the Department of the Interior. Nature has taken a hand in this game and has brought to us a serious internal problem which we must not ignore. I have a picture here handed to me by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON] which shows a dust storm in the Southwest. This picture bears witness to the necessity for more help in the Department of the Interior. A large area of our Nation is being devastated, and to prevent the destruction is a problem of the Department of the Interior. Crops are being ruined, homes are being lost, farms are being blown away and means of livelihood are being taken from farmers.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. No. I do not have time just now.

We are soon to be faced with the proposition of protecting our territory in the Southwest from becoming a barren desert. You Members who live in that section of the country should take that matter into consideration when you cast your vote upon this question. Soon the functions of the Department of the Interior will touch your constituents more closely than ever.

In this Nation we have the bituminous-coal-mining industry. The deplorable and chaotic condition of that industry all over the United States for the past 30 years bears witness to the necessity for more help in the Department of the Interior. Here we have an industry that is overmanned 50 percent, and we are face to face with the necessity of regulating that industry in order that the people who are employed in it may be able to have a living wage and live under decent living conditions, as other people throughout the United States live. It is one of the basic industries of this Nation, one in which 65 percent of the cost of production goes to labor. It has been productive of more industrial strife than has any other industry. We cannot permit it to continue unregulated. The Guffey coal bill is designed to stabilize this industry, and I hope will soon be passed, in order that it can extend relief to the most shamefully exploited class of workers in this Nation. Its administration will be under the Department of the Interior. The problems of the Department of the Interior will multiply with every year of our national existence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this report is exactly \$1,663,489 under the Budget estimate.

Mr. FADDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I think we can afford this additional \$10,000 position for the services we will receive.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, it is about \$15,000,000 above the appropriations for this Department last year.

Mr. SNELL. They did not tell us that.

Mr. FADDIS. You should also state that there has recently been 15 or more agencies added to the Department of the Interior, making the appropriation necessary.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said a while ago that no evidence has been presented to show the necessity for creating this office, that Mr. Ickes himself had not appeared before the committee, broken down, and confessed he needed it. If there were no necessity for creating this office, Mr. Ickes himself would have come down and told us that he did not want it.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Ickes is too busy attending to his duties to come begging for help. Why work a willing horse to death? Mr. Ickes and the Nation needs this assistant. I think the best piece of evidence in support of this proposition is the picture handed me a short time ago by the gentleman from Kansas showing this dust storm. We must bear in mind these dust storms in the southwestern portion of the United States and the conditions they have brought upon that section of the country. They make this position a necessity, because they affect the welfare of the entire Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have known Harold L. Ickes for 25 years. He has always been known as a progressive. He is an honest man, an able man, a man of excellent judgment and sense, a man of the highest courage. Every man who has known him for any length of time knows that what I am saying is literally true; and those who have studied his work here, or elsewhere, will come to exactly the same conclusion reached by the Chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, and that is that whatever might have been his opinion of him heretofore, it now is that Harold L. Ickes is the best man we could get for this place and is doing his job as no other man could do it.

I want to close by saying that his character is such that if he did not need this assistant he would be the last man under the sun to ask for the creation of the position of Under Secretary. When he asks for it, it ought to be granted to him, because of his numerous activities, and because of new work that is being piled on him all the time. It seems to me that we ought to awake to the fact that criticism, unless justified, ought not to be accepted; and in not a single instance has criticism of Harold L. Ickes been justified. I am glad of the opportunity of saying this word about a fellow Illinoisan, Harold L. Ickes, our great Secretary of the Interior. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur in Senate amendments nos. 1 and 3.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I join in this request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 92, answered "present" 1, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—243

Adair	Buck	Colmer	Dickstein
Andrew, Mass.	Buckler, Minn.	Connery	Dies
Arnold	Bulwinkle	Cooper, Tenn.	Dietrich
Ayers	Burch	Costello	Dingell
Barden	Caldwell	Cox	Dobbins
Beiter	Cannon, Mo.	Cravens	Dockweiler
Bell	Carmichael	Crosby	Dorsey
Biermann	Cary	Cross, Tex.	Doughton
Blinderup	Castellow	Crosser, Ohio	Doxey
Blanton	Celler	Crowe	Drewry
Boileau	Chandler	Cullen	Driscoll
Boylan	Chapman	Cummings	Driver
Brennan	Church	Daly	Duffey, Ohio
Brewster	Claiborne	Darden	Duffy, N. Y.
Brooks	Clark, N. C.	Dear	Duncan
Brown, Ga.	Coffee	Deen	Dunn, Pa.
Brunner	Colden	Delaney	Eagle
Buchanan		Dempsey	Eckert

Edmiston	Jones	Montet	Scott
Eicher	Kee	Moran	Scrugham
Evans	Keller	Moritz	Sears
Faddis	Kelly	Murdock	Secrest
Farley	Kenney	Nelson	Shanley
Ferguson	Kerr	Nichols	Sirovich
Fiesinger	Kleberg	Norton	Smith, Conn.
Fitzpatrick	Kloeb	O'Brien	Smith, Va.
Flannagan	Kniffin	O'Connell	Smith, W. Va.
Fletcher	Kocialkowski	O'Connor	Snyder
Fuller	Kramer	O'Day	South
Fulmer	Kvale	O'Leary	Spence
Gassaway	Lambertson	Oliver	Stack
Gearhart	Lambeth	O'Neal	Steagall
Gildea	Larrabee	Parks	Stubbs
Gillette	Lea, Calif.	Parsons	Sutphin
Gingery	Lesinski	Patman	Taylor, Colo.
Goldsborough	Lewis, Colo.	Patton	Taylor, Tenn.
Gray, Pa.	Lloyd	Pearson	Terry
Green	Lucas	Peterson, Fla.	Thom
Greenwood	Luckey	Peterson, Ga.	Thomason
Greever	Lundeen	Pettengill	Thompson
Gregory	McAndrews	Pierce	Tonry
Hamlin	McClellan	Polk	Umstead
Hancock, N. C.	McCormack	Rabaut	Utterback
Hart	McGehee	Ramsay	Wallgren
Harter	McGrath	Randolph	Walter
Healey	McGroarty	Rankin	Warren
Hennings	McKeough	Reece	Weaver
Hildebrandt	McLaughlin	Richards	Welch
Hill, Ala.	Mahon	Richardson	Werner
Hill, Knute	Maloney	Robertson	West
Hill, Samuel B.	Mansfield	Robinson, Utah	Whelchel
Hobbs	Martin, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.	White
Hoepfel	Mason	Romjue	Whittington
Houston	Massingale	Russell	Wilcox
Huddleston	Maverick	Sadowski	Williams
Igoe	May	Sanders, La.	Wilson, La.
Jacobsen	Mead	Sanders, Tex.	Wolverton
Jenckes, Ind.	Meeks	Sandlin	Wood
Johnson, Okla.	Merritt, N. Y.	Sauthoff	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Mitchell, Ill.	Schaefer	Zioncheck
Johnson, W. Va.	Monaghan	Schulte	

## NAYS—92

Allen	Eaton	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.
Amle	Ekwall	Lehlbach	Rich
Andresen	Engel	Lemke	Robison, Ky.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fenerty	Lord	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Fish	Ludlow	Seger
Bacharach	Focht	McLean	Short
Bacon	Ford, Miss.	McLeod	Snell
Blackney	Gifford	Maas	Stefan
Bolton	Gilchrist	Mapes	Stewart
Buckbee	Goodwin	Marshall	Sweeney
Burdick	Gray, Ind.	Merritt, Conn.	Taber
Carlson	Gwynne	Michener	Tarver
Cavicchia	Halleck	Millard	Taylor, S. C.
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock, N. Y.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Thurston
Collins	Hess	Mott	Tinkham
Cooper, Ohio	Hoffman	Owen	Treadway
Crawford	Hollister	Patterson	Truax
Crowther	Holmes	Pittenger	Turner
Darrow	Hope	Plumley	Turpin
Dirksen	Hull	Powers	Wearin
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Ramspeck	Wigglesworth
Doutrich	Kimball	Ransley	Wolcott
Dunn, Miss.	Kinzer	Reed, Ill.	Wolfenden

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Woodrum

## NOT VOTING—95

Ashbrook	DeRouen	Kennedy, Md.	Rudd
Bankhead	Disney	Kennedy, N. Y.	Ryan
Beam	Ditter	Kopplemann	Sabath
Berlin	Ellenbogen	Lamneck	Schneider
Bland	Englebright	Lanham	Schuetz
Bloom	Fernandez	Lee, Okla.	Shannon
Boehne	Ford, Calif.	Lewis, Md.	Sisson
Boland	Frey	McFarlane	Smith, Wash.
Brown, Mich.	Gambrill	McMillan	Somers, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	McReynolds	Starnes
Burnham	Gavagan	McSwain	Sullivan
Cannon, Wis.	Gehrmann	Marcantonio	Summers, Tex.
Carden	Granfield	Martin, Mass.	Thomas
Carpenter	Greenway	Miller	Tobey
Carter	Griswold	Montague	Tolan
Cartwright	Guy	O'Malley	Underwood
Casey	Haines	Palmisano	Vinson, Ga.
Christianson	Harlan	Perkins	Vinson, Ky.
Clark, Idaho	Hartley	Peyser	Wadsworth
Cochran	Higgins, Conn.	Pfeiffer	Wilson, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Higgins, Mass.	Quinn	Withrow
Cooley	Hook	Rayburn	Woodruff
Corning	Imhoff	Reilly	Zimmerman
Culkin	Kahn	Rogers, N. H.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harlan (for) with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts (against).  
Mr. Gehrmann (for) with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut (against).

Mr. Cartwright (for) with Mr. Tobey (against).  
Mr. Bland (for) with Mr. Thomas (against).  
Mr. Withrow (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).  
Mr. McMillan (for) with Mr. Culkin (against).  
Mr. Ashbrook (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).  
Mr. Granfield (for) with Mr. Perkins (against).  
Mr. Schuetz (for) with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania (against).  
Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Woodruff (against).  
Mr. Haines (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).

## Until further notice:

Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Christianson.  
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Guyer.  
Mr. McSwain with Mrs. Kahn.  
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Englebright.  
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Marcantonio.  
Mr. Disney with Mr. Schneider.  
Mr. Vinson of Kentucky with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Burnham.  
Mr. Corning with Mr. Berlin.  
Mr. Miller with Mr. Cooley.  
Mr. Rudd with Mr. Lamneck.  
Mr. McFarlane with Mr. Clark of Idaho.  
Mr. Boland with Mr. Pfeiffer.  
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Frey.  
Mr. Somers of New York with Mrs. Greenway.  
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Tolan.  
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Ryan.  
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Zimmerman.  
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Hook.  
Mr. Ford of California with Mr. Casey.  
Mr. Sabath with Mr. DeRouen.  
Mr. Carden with Mr. Sullivan.  
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Imhoff.  
Mr. Sisson with Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Gavagan.  
Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Ellenbogen.  
Mr. Reilly with Mr. Montague.  
Mr. Carpenter with Mr. Quinn.  
Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Buckley of New York.  
Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Cole of Maryland.  
Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Beam.  
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Lanham.  
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MEAD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, is absent on account of important business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment no. 5: Strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 5 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert the following: "\$150,000 for payment of subsistence and expenses of advisory committee of local stockmen, \$100,000; in all, \$250,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment no. 38:

"Audit of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians: For the purpose of making an audit of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians, including, without limitation, an engineering audit of the timber operations on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin, to be immediately available, \$20,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Menominee Indians: *Provided*, That to accomplish said audit the tribal council or business committee of said Menominee Indians may enter into a contract or contracts, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, with a firm of certified public accountants, and, with a timber engineer: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for related investigations, for services, travel, and other expenses necessary to a complete engineering and general audit, expenditures for such purposes to be paid upon presentation by attorneys acting for said Menominee Indians of itemized vouchers approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 38 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the various votes on the Senate amendments in disagreement was laid on the table.

#### THE SOUTH AND THE NEW DEAL KISS OF DEATH

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Representative HAMILTON FISH, Jr., at a Republican banquet at Woodstock, Va., Thursday evening, April 25, 1935:

I am as eager for the welfare and prosperity of the South as I am for my own State of New York. The "new dealers", in order to save their faces, persist in driving the Southern textile and cotton States into a crisis more serious than the Civil War. Already cotton States have lost over 50 percent of their export trade to foreign nations, and another 2 years of the fantastic destruction of crops and the pegging of cotton at 12 cents, far above the world price, will bring desolation to the South and great financial losses to the entire Nation. Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, and Senators Byrd and Glass, of Virginia, see the handwriting on the wall that spells the word "ruin" in unmistakable letters. The loss of the world markets for the surplus cotton crops of the South means inevitable economic disaster and financial ruin. For the sake of temporary profit to the cotton growers and in order to pursue nebulous mirages under an Alice in Wonderland theory of reduction of crops—the more reduction the more wealth—the whole economic future of the South is being sacrificed on an altar of new-deal expedients and experiments.

The situation is far too serious to ignore any longer, and is attributable to the socialistic new-deal policies which have increased unemployment in the South and brought ruin and misery to the tenant farmers and share-croppers. There is less cotton being exported than at any time since the Civil War, due to the kiss of death from the Wallaces, Tugwells, and Ezekiels, and, as a result of the loss of our cotton exports, hundreds of thousands of southerners engaged in planting, harvesting, ginning, compressing, transporting, shipping, and in warehouses and mills have lost their jobs. The A. A. A. program of reduction of cotton crops by 25 percent may have benefited temporarily some producers, but there are millions of people in the South who are being adversely affected, as are all consumers. The southern shipping ports of Norfolk, Charleston, and Savannah are suffering from the rapidly vanishing cotton export trade.

The wand wavers and magic performers at Washington, in addition to condemning the principles of Jeffersonian democracy, will, by their costly blunders and crazy-quilt experiments, wreck the economic stability of the South. Even the Democrats of the South do not propose to commit economic suicide for the benefit of the "new dealers" and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a free trader and internationalist. It must be self-evident that the American mill workers in the South cannot compete with skilled Japanese textile labor paid 20 cents a day. However, Secretary Hull, true to his free-trade principles and long-distance economic policies which will take effect after the southern mills have been destroyed and their employees ruined, is deaf, dumb, and blind to the interests of the American textile industry, our second largest industry, which employs 400,000 industrious and loyal American citizens. I charge the visionary free-trade policies of Secretary Hull with wrecking the textile industry of the South, one of its greatest sources of wealth and employment.

Just as sure as fate, if President Roosevelt is renominated by the Democrats, a constitutional and Jeffersonian Democratic Party will spring up in the Southern States, and I predict that in 1936 Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Florida will be found in the Republican column.

Let me point out that it is not the Republicans who are criticizing the administration in the severest manner and in the bitterest terms. What about the two United States Senators from the State of Virginia, who have repeatedly denounced the A. A. A. and the N. R. A.? They have attacked them more vigorously and far more bitterly than any Republican has ever dared to denounce them. I refer to the radio speech a few nights ago by Senator BYRD against the A. A. A. and the recent speech of Senator GLASS against the N. R. A. The distinguished Senator from Maryland, Senator TYDINGS, has the courage of his convictions as to the N. R. A. and the A. A. A., and stated within the last week that they were the greatest monstrosities ever imposed upon the American people.

Governor Talmadge, of the great State of Georgia, almost the adopted State of the President, issued a statement only a day or two ago that it would be the greatest calamity to the country if the President is renominated by the Democratic Party. I will not refer to Senator LONG, for he has a habit of speaking for himself. Add to these prominent Democrats Alfred E. Smith and John W.

Davis, both candidates of their party for President, and Bainbridge Colby and Newton D. Baker, both former Democratic Cabinet officers, who have swelled the chorus of criticism and denunciation of the unsound, unworkable new-deal measures. Every argument advanced by the defenders of the new deal in its destruction of Jeffersonian principles and of our American system for a regimented form of State socialism can be answered by the bitter outbursts of leading Democrats.

Let me say as one Republican, and I think speaking for all, that we have no apology to offer for opposing the administration's new-deal policies where they have failed, for exposing them, for criticizing them, and for condemning them. We believe it is not only our right but our duty to show to the American people the failure and break-down of these unsound, unworkable, and socialistic policies.

For 2 years we have been in the midst of Government by propaganda and ballyhoo, with hundreds of paid publicity agents, paid out of the Treasury of the United States, getting out news every hour of the day, making up news in defense of the new-deal administration, and getting it over the radio to the people back home, swamping them with misinformation and propaganda and trying to make them believe that Roosevelt and recovery are synonymous. And what do we find? We find a million and a half more unemployed today than there were a year ago, we find the breakdown of both the A. A. A. and the N. R. A., we find the people are impoverished, we find destruction of business confidence, and no consistent economic policy except to pile debt upon debt and borrow billions, more billions, and still more billions without regard to the day of reckoning and of the inevitable inflation, chaos, ruin, and bankruptcy.

The "new dealers" admit that they do not know where we are going. That is apparent, of course, by this time to the American people. No Democrat knows where we are going, but they say, "We are not going back." We are not going back to what? To 1926? The main policy of the Democratic Party, as enunciated by the "new dealers", time after time, has been to get back to the price levels of 1926, under the Calvin Coolidge administration. Between 1921 and 1929 what happened? Under the sound policies of the Republican Party business confidence was restored, American labor was employed, employed at the highest standard of wages and living ever known in this country, or in any country in the history of the world. Why? Because of the sound policies of the Republican Party. Because the Budget was balanced, the national debt reduced, national economy practiced, because business men knew what money was worth, and as a result confidence pervaded the land from one end of the country to the other, which put American labor to work, and the Lord knows there is not a thinking man or woman in America today who would not like to go back to the prosperous times of 1926 when American labor was employed and received wages such as were paid at no other time or in no other nation in history. What is lacking today is confidence, without which there can be no employment of labor or business profits or return to prosperous times. The main issue before the American people is the reemployment of 11,000,000 loyal American citizens who are now walking the streets and looking for jobs. It is beginning to be more and more apparent that there will be no permanent jobs and no real prosperity until the sound policies of the Republican Party and a Republican administration is restored to power to uphold our American system, and the imported state socialism of the "new dealers" is repudiated and discarded.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the business of the House, I renew my request for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein remarks made to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States this morning by Mr. Johnston.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the speech introduced in the RECORD by the gentleman from Kentucky should have been objected to. It was not a proper document to put in the RECORD. It has been repeatedly stated here by both the majority and minority that it is not good practice and certainly not economical government for Members to insert other speeches than their own in the RECORD. However, may I say, with all deference to my distinguished and beloved colleague from Kentucky, who I see is on his feet ready to get into an argument—

Mr. MAY. I do not wish to engage in any argument with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia; but the principal reason why I inserted that speech in the RECORD this morning was that it paid a great tribute to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the State of Virginia. I am just wondering if the gentleman from Virginia objects to such a speech?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not object to the part of the speech that pays tribute to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, or the State of Virginia; but I do object to the part of the speech which I heard, and it was very cynical, very caustic, and generally critical of the efforts of our Chief Executive who is at this time trying to save the Nation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, if I had known that criticism was in the speech I would have objected. I slipped up by not objecting to an outsider's speech being put in the RECORD; however, if I had known that it criticized the President of the United States I would have objected. I am surprised a Democrat would put it in the RECORD.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that I listened intently to the speech and heard every word of it. If I understand anything about the meaning of the English language, the speech read as a whole does not contain a single sentence, word, or intimation anywhere in the way of criticism of the President of the United States. On the other hand, it pays tribute to him and compares him with Jefferson, Washington, Madison, and Monroe, and even says he is such a great Democrat he went as far south as Georgia to select a new home in order that he may be another great southerner.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism to make of the speech which the gentleman had inserted in the RECORD as a speech, and it was not my purpose to bring that matter up at this time. But to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] who is now asking unanimous consent to insert a speech in the RECORD may I say that the gentleman has consumed 2 hours of the Nation's time today in forcing two unnecessary roll calls because a Member objected to his introduction of the speech in the RECORD. Now, the gentleman prefaces his request by saying, "In order to expedite business", and proceeds to ask unanimous consent, thereby inferring if he does not get the consent he will demand a roll call.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman must be a mind reader.

Mr. WOODRUM. I did not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the right attitude to take. Important business is before the Congress. The people of this country want the Congress to do business and not fritter away time. If the gentleman and his side want to take the responsibility, they can do so, because I object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I object too.

#### A POLICY OF REGULATION OR A POLICY OF RUIN?

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] last Thursday over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on Thursday night, April 25, at 9:45 o'clock, from Washington, D. C.:

When you turned the radio on tonight, you summoned to your command the services of the light and power industry. You do the same thing every time you switch on the lights, or use a washing machine, or a curling iron, or an electric refrigerator, or a toaster, or a vacuum cleaner. It is, perhaps, the industry that enters into our day's work and play most intimately and most frequently.

I feel, therefore, that I am under a special obligation to call to your attention the fact that this industry faces a very serious danger. There is before Congress a measure, known as the "public-utilities bill", which calls for the destruction of the utility holding company, and which puts the operating company under a kind of Government management.

You may be one of the 10,000,000 individuals who have put their savings in a few shares of public-utility securities. It is my duty to tell you that this bill will impair the value of your investment. Whether you are an investor or not, you are, I know, a member of the 21,000,000 families who use electric current, and I feel that it is equally my duty to say to you that this bill will impair the service which you are receiving.

I am telling you this tonight because I want to give you my frank and honest opinion before any vote is taken on this measure in the House of Representatives. No one knows what will happen in the tomorrow. But tonight I am anxious to make clear to the American people the issues which are involved in this extraordinary legislative proposal.

Now, in the mad days of 1929 there was wild speculation in the securities of public utilities, as in other industries, and in certain companies unsound financial structures developed. In the crash that followed many innocent people suffered, and there has been a tendency ever since to blame the entire public-utility industry for the errors of a few companies that sinned. It was because we

wanted to prevent that situation from recurring that we in Congress passed the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, designed to protect the investor in the flotation and sale of securities.

If these acts do not effectively achieve that purpose—if they are not adequate to prevent a return of the inflationary and highly speculative stock-market situation of 1929—then they should be strengthened. If there are other abuses which have crept into the relationship between utility holding companies and operating companies, these should be corrected by regulation.

I am impressed by the fact that the utility companies themselves are in favor of reasonable regulation. They have said so publicly, and they have made specific proposals to the House committee which has been holding hearings on this bill.

But the trouble is that this bill does not regulate—it destroys! Under the terms of this bill the holding company must be abolished within 5 years.

In recent months an impression has been circulated that the holding company is some kind of a newly developed and complicated device with a rather bad reputation. The impression is entirely wrong. A holding company is simply a company that owns stock in other companies. It has existed for over a hundred years. It has two principal purposes:

First. To offer centralized, skilled management to small, isolated companies so that each can draw upon the experience and skill of the system as a whole; and

Second. To provide adequate financial support so that the local unit, which would not be able to borrow money or sell securities itself, need not lack funds for its extensions and improvements.

You will remember that more than a century and a half ago, when Benjamin Franklin was urging the Thirteen Independent Colonies to join together if they wanted to present a strong front against the demands of George III of England, he took a stick in his hands, for illustration, and broke it; then he tied 13 sticks together, and although each one could have been broken separately, together they were strong.

That is the principle behind the holding company. It exists in every major industry, in automobiles, foods, oil and gas, merchandise of all kinds, newspapers, meats, cigarettes, and so on. Most of the companies which stand highest in American industry today are holding companies. More than that—and this is a very strange thing in the light of this present bill—the United States Government itself apparently has given its approval to the holding company. By Executive order of the President of the United States issued December 19, 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority has formed a holding company, under the laws of the State of Delaware. One of the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and formerly a member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, is Mr. David E. Lillenthal. In 1929 he made this statement, which is a significant tribute to the contribution which the holding company has made to electrical America:

"Since the pioneer public-utility acts of New York and Wisconsin were enacted 2 decades ago, a new figure, the holding and management company, has come upon the field, demonstrated its prowess, and in a relatively few years changed the entire economic nature of the public-utility industry. Isolated plants have given way to great systems, whose lines span several States and serve hundreds of communities, all operated under unified managerial and financial supervision. The spread of rural electrification, the amazing advances in telephony, the rise of super-power systems—these and many other technological developments so intimately related to the public welfare are directly attributable to the efforts of the holding company. Perhaps most important of all, to the holding company must go the credit for the unprecedented flow of capital into the public-utility industry making possible extensions and improvements of service."

What does all this mean to you as an individual?

Well, first of all, it means stable and certain service. Many of you will remember the days when electric service was frequently interrupted or cut off or when there was a flicker in the light. Those days are past. By making it possible for the small plant to finance continued improvements and expansions, the holding company has assured us of an uninterrupted supply of electricity. More than that, it has made it possible to provide that service at a lower cost. Rates for electricity have, of course, steadily declined in the last 50 years. The cost of living, for example, is 39 percent higher now than in the period 1910-14. The cost of residence electricity is 41 percent lower.

But the important thing, from the standpoint of this holding-company question, is that rates are lower under holding-company control than where the companies are independent. I have a list of 140 independent companies located in small towns in all sections of the United States. I also have a list of 140 companies under holding-company control located in the same geographical areas and in towns of comparable size. The cost of electricity was less in the towns supplied by the holding-company affiliates in every case except two.

I was also interested to discover what happened to the rates of an operating company immediately before and after it was acquired by a holding company. In a study of 417 cities and towns the cost to the domestic consumer ranged from 28 percent less to 43 percent less shortly after acquisition.

On the basis of these facts, does it seem wise to ruin the holding company? And when this destruction takes place, what is going to happen to the investor?

There are, I repeat, more than 10,000,000 individual holders of public-utility securities in the United States. About 5,000,000 of

them own the securities of holding companies. If you are one of these people, your investment is in grave danger.

This is what would happen if the holding company is dissolved: The assets of a holding company are the common stocks of the operating companies which it owns. The holding company has issued, let us say, bonds, preferred stocks, and common stocks. It must first pay off its bonds and preferred stock in cash. To raise the money for this it must sell its assets—its operating-company stocks—in a market in which all the other holding companies are dumping their operating-company securities. It would be a forced sale. Nobody wants to buy something that everybody is selling. Maybe there would be enough buyers of the holding-company assets to pay off the holding-company bonds. It might even be able to pay something on its preferred stock, if it was lucky. Certainly its common-stock holders would have their investment entirely destroyed.

Some of the Government proponents of this bill have suggested various elaborate methods, like trusteeships, or certificates of interest, and so on, whereby they have tried to minimize the losses which would result from dissolution. I do not have time to discuss these methods in detail. I can only say to you that there is no possible way whereby the holding-company investment can be protected if the holding company itself is destroyed.

I submit that to you as a reasonable proposition. The assets of a holding company, I say again, are the common stocks of its operating companies. If all over the country these operating-company common stocks must be sold in order that the holding company can retire its own securities and dissolve, who is going to buy, and what kind of a price can the seller obtain?

At the hearings before the House committee, in addition to the public-utility executives themselves, business men, bankers, economists, and investors testified as to the ruinous effects which the bill would have upon investments. The President of a life-insurance company pointed out that it would "destroy the investments made in good faith by this company." The president of the American Federation of Utility Investors cried out in protest that this bill would destroy the hard-earned savings of millions of American people.

That is why the enormous amount of mail arriving in Washington when Congress is in session has become larger than ever in recent weeks. Hundreds of thousands of letters have been received by Congressmen and Senators protesting against the enactment of this bill. These letters are a product of fear. They come, in many instances, from lonely and despairing people who see their last dollar being taken away from them by Government fiat.

I realize very well that some of the Government proponents of this bill have criticized these letters as "propaganda" stirred up by the utility interests. I do not believe that. No industrial group could possibly organize a personal, spontaneous, and sometimes heart-breaking protest of this kind. And I want to say to you that this expression of your opinion is your unquestioned right. I want to say to you that I believe it is the duty of the Members of Congress in a democracy such as ours to listen to what the people have to say. I for one will oppose to the last breath the effort on the part of anyone to curtail the right of the citizen of the United States to send letters to his Government representatives in regard to legislation which affects the way he lives.

Now, I think it must have occurred to you, as it has occurred to me, that there is another way—a more American way—whereby we can handle the utilities problem; and that is the way of regulation rather than the way of ruin. Let us consider these abuses carefully and find out which ones still exist. Let us then propose the necessary legislation to make sure that these abuses cannot reoccur. Then, under a system of fair regulation, the public utilities, with their large potential purchasing power and their vital contribution to industrial life, can continue to function. Let us give them a chance to lead the way to economic recovery, which is just as important to you and to me as economic reform.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL OF 1936

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to several amendments to the Post Office appropriation bill for the next fiscal year which will benefit the postal employees and result in improved mail service throughout the country.

#### CLERKS AND CARRIERS

Before the bill passed the House the appropriations for clerical hire in first- and second-class post offices and for city delivery service were increased by a million dollars each. These additional allotments, approved by the Senate and written into the permanent bill, will permit the Department to fill existing vacancies by the promotion of approximately 1,300 substitutes to the position of regular clerks and carriers, will provide additional funds for the

hiring of substitutes to augment the regular force, and will result in speeding up delivery of the mail.

#### RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE

The House also approved an increase of \$900,000 in the appropriation for travel allowance to railway postal clerks. The amount provided in the bill was insufficient to pay the basic travel allowance of \$3 per day, which becomes effective on July 1, 1935, when present provisions of the economy legislation automatically expire. The amendment merely corrects an obvious injustice to a most efficient and deserving class of Government employees by restoring the basic rate of travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, as provided in the act of February 28, 1925.

This allowance, which was cut to \$2 per day under the Economy Act, is to cover actual expenses of railway postal clerks while on duty away from home and does not commence until after the clerk has been on duty 10 hours.

The allowance is divided into four items—one lodging and three meals. Only such items as are necessary and are actually used are allowed, and only after the first 10 hours have been disregarded. It is perfectly obvious to anyone that it is impossible to obtain suitable lodging in any city for 50 cents, nor is 50 cents a very large sum with which to buy a meal in the average restaurant such as will sustain a man at manual labor through the night on a moving train.

The Senate approved the increase of \$900,000 for travel allowance, and added \$100,000 to the salary appropriation for the Railway Mail Service, to which the House agreed.

#### SALARY RESTORATION

The Congress previously voted for restoration of the basic rate of pay for Federal employees, and the salary appropriations contained in the Post Office appropriation bill provide for full restoration of pay to all postal employees.

#### POST-OFFICE INSPECTORS

The force of post-office inspectors will be increased from 525 to 540, in addition to the 15 inspectors in charge. The post-office inspection force is the oldest investigative force of the Government, dating back to colonial days. Although but 25 percent of the work of this branch of the Department is in apprehending criminals and bringing them to trial, its work compares favorably with that of any other Government organization, and it holds the unusual record of having brought about convictions in 98 percent of its criminal cases.

Inspectors are select men, selected from within the Postal Service for their experience and outstanding ability. Some of the prominent men in our Nation's history have been post-office inspectors at some time in their career.

This division saves the Government millions of dollars and has brought to justice criminals whose acts have emblazoned the front pages of our newspapers and terrified the country. Our post-office inspectors work quietly, but efficiently; they track down the train robbers, mail-truck bandits, safe crackers, post-office burglars, kidnapers, and all sorts of dangerous criminals who prey upon the Postal Service; and they have a record of which they can be justly proud.

#### IMPROVED MAIL SERVICE

In addition to the increased allowances for clerk and carrier hire, which will assist materially in improving the handling of the mails and their speedy transportation, the appropriation for unusual conditions at post offices was increased from \$65,000 to \$75,000 by the Senate and concurred in by the House.

This appropriation will take care of unusual conditions which cannot be met by the existing postal facilities. For instance, an oil or a land boom in any community will quickly affect the population and give the post office more work than can be handled satisfactorily without additional help. The holiday seasons also impose added burdens upon the Postal Service and make it necessary to put on more help to meet the emergency.

The additional allowance for this cause is to meet the estimated demands upon the Service and to place the De-

partment in a position to meet these demands as they occur and to satisfy the postal patrons.

The Department is also planning to extend and improve the Rural Route Service.

#### RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE

A committee amendment on the floor of the House added \$300,000 to the \$94,000,000 appropriation for Rural Route Service, in order to permit the Post Office Department to put into effect its entire program, covering approximately 200 new routes and nearly 5,500 extensions. This will mean improved mail service throughout the entire Rural Delivery Service and the extension of the benefits of this Service to more than 42,000 families who are now without such service.

#### FOREIGN AIR MAIL

In the Senate an amendment was inserted in the bill providing an additional \$2,000,000 for air mail service across the Pacific. The successful flight of the Pan American Airways within the last 10 days has aroused keen interest in spanning the Pacific and bringing us in quicker communication with China and the islands in between. Although this amendment was defeated in the House, it was only with the understanding that it would be favorably considered in connection with the next deficiency appropriation bill.

In 1928 Congress enacted legislation to permit the Post Office Department to enter into contracts for the transportation of mail by air to foreign countries and insular possessions of the United States, and in 1929 Congress enlarged the provisions of that act to meet further demands for this rapid means of transportation.

From a small ferry service in 1927, between Key West and Cuba, our foreign air mail service has spread out to Central and South America, and now it is trying its wings all the way to China. The flight just the other day of one of the master clipper ships of Pan American Air Lines from Alameda, Calif., to Honolulu, a distance of approximately 2,400 miles, in less than 18 hours, was the inaugural flight in our effort to establish an air trade route to the Orient. All the nations of the world are competing with each other in the race for trade, and all countries are spreading out and seeking new fields. If we are not prompt in acquiring rights in foreign countries, we will find our competitors there ahead of us and the market closed to us. Our aviators have the genius, the skill, and the daring to fly the Pacific; it is up to us to match their courage by our willingness and zeal in backing their exploits and cooperating with them in carrying America's good will to foreign ports.

#### THE BANKING ACT OF 1935

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide for the sound, effective, and uninterrupted operation of the banking system, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KNUTSON) there were—ayes 172, noes 6.

The SPEAKER (while the House was dividing). The Chair will take cognizance of the fact that five Republicans left the Hall when the Chair began to count.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-five Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, with Mr. WOODRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 40 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for questions if he is given this additional time?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I have never refused to yield to a Member of this House at any time since I have been a Member of this body when I obtained time to speak, either by unanimous consent or in my own right. I hope the gentleman will not undertake to require me to make a promise in order to obtain consent at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, since I am interested in section 2, and that is the part of the bill which the gentleman proposes to discuss, I would like to have assurance he will answer some questions which I desire to propound in this 40 minutes' time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] if he is going to allow those of us who have requested time, not members of the committee, to have an opportunity to speak in the general discussion of this bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman that I am endeavoring to obtain an extension of the time for general debate on this bill. I hope the matter may be arranged. However, it does not rest upon any decision of my own. If additional time is granted, there will be no difficulty in affording reasonable opportunity to every Member of the House who has up to this hour submitted a request for time. Unless the time of the general debate is extended, I shall be obliged to consider first applications for time on the part of members of the Committee on the majority side of the House, and I have not had an opportunity up to this time to estimate the time that will be required to accommodate members of the Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I highly regard the gentleman from Alabama. I dislike very much to object, but unless I can at least get assurance from the gentleman that he will answer two or three or four questions that I would like to ask him, or that I can get at least a few minutes' time, I think I should object.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will repeat that I have never declined to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McFARLANE. I object.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, do we understand that objection was made to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes; I objected. The gentleman would not give me any time.

Mr. COX. Then I renew the request, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Alabama have unanimous consent to yield to himself 40 additional minutes, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will not object.

Mr. McFARLANE. I object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH].

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, in this discussion it will be necessary to refer to bankers and to refer to banks, and at times it may seem that there is a degree of personal hostility to banks and bankers. The speaker wants to emphasize the fact that he has no personal hostility to bankers or to banks. As a matter of fact, I have been a director in two banks for over 30 years and the attorney for several banks for fully that length of time. I understand thoroughly the tremendous problems they have to solve, the difficulties in which they find themselves in serving their communities, and the very high standard of energy and intelligence most of them use. Any criticism offered is of our banking system and not of the individual bankers or of the individual banks.

There has been a great deal of discussion in the newspapers of title II of this bill. In my opinion, it is not worth while to take the time of the Committee to discuss title I or title III. The material that goes to make up both of these titles is almost entirely of a perfecting nature, and the controversy here is over title II insofar as there is a legitimate controversy.

The changes made by title II in the original philosophy of the Federal Reserve Act are very, very slight. The Federal Reserve Act has been perverted to the use of the banking

system, and the thing which this bill undertakes to do in a mandatory way is to restore the philosophy that was intended to be incorporated in the act as it was originally passed. Some years ago, when Mark Twain was in good health, the newspapers reported his death, and he sent out a telegram to the effect that the reports of his death had been greatly exaggerated, and I assure you that the reports of the changes created by this bill in the basic philosophy of our central banking system have been grossly exaggerated and grossly misstated by that part of society that has interested itself to keep control not only of a banking system, to which we do not object, but to keep absolute control of the people's money; that is, the people's medium of exchange.

In order to understand fully just what the endeavor is in this bill it is, in my opinion, necessary to discuss the history of attempted monetary legislation in the American Congress.

You all know that the Constitution of the United States contemplates that the American Congress shall coin the money of the country—that is, the medium of exchange, whatever it may be—to coin that thing that people use to exchange their goods and services; and that the Constitution also contemplates that the American Congress shall regulate the value of that medium of exchange. Obviously the American Congress cannot physically do this. A body of 435 cannot do this; but the American Congress can state the policy which it desires pursued in order that the people may have the best possible medium of exchange and delegate the administration somewhere else, and they can do this under the Constitution. But up until this minute, Mr. Chairman, the American Congress has never had the hardihood to coin money and regulate its value. It has never had the hardihood to exercise this great duty imposed upon it by our fathers. It has never had the hardihood to take from the banking class the power to issue and to control the people's medium of exchange and to place it under a mandate into hands whose only interest it would be only to exercise it for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. If that be so, that the people's interest should be paramount, does not the gentleman feel that the merchants of this country, representing agriculture, industry, and commerce would be best fitted to operate and conduct the banks under the laws to be prescribed by Congress rather than have the private bankers control them or even have the Government itself exercise control; and I have in mind, if the gentleman please, the Bank of England and the history of the conduct of that institution?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I may say, in answer to the gentleman, the business of banking is a business of lending money and collecting money. A bank is a lending institution.

As far as I am concerned, an institution of that kind should have no more governmental control than any other private business.

The difficulty in this country with banking, as such, is minor. The chief function exercised by the banks is the control of the medium of exchange, which is not a banking function at all, but a function for society to exercise for the benefit of all the people.

Up to this hour we have never had the exercise of that function by society. It is a strange thing to me, it is a great mystery, why the section of the Constitution which imposes on Congress the duty to issue money, to regulate its value, is the only section which has been utterly and entirely disregarded.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. KENNEY. Under title II there is no provision for banking balances to be placed in any central or single bank so that the central bank, and only the central bank, can know at a given time what the bank balances are.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. There is no special machinery set up in title II. The gentleman is right.

Mr. KENNEY. Is it not necessary for proper control of credit that bank balances should be known at all times and

the knowledge of the balances lodged exclusively in the controlling power?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The bank balances are known 15 minutes after the bank closes.

Mr. KENNEY. Is it not true that it takes a week?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not believe that criticism is justified. Now, if Members will permit me to finish without interruption, I will be glad to answer questions afterward.

The history of attempted legislation to get the people's medium of exchange away from the banks and into the hands of society as is specifically required under the Constitution—so far as I know, begins in 1922, when a bill was introduced providing for the variation of the gold content of the dollar for the purpose of maintaining a stable purchasing power for the dollar.

Extensive hearings were held on that bill in the Sixty-seventh Congress, and also in the Sixty-eighth Congress.

In 1926, some of the Republican Members became interested in the same subject. At that time the Democrats were in the minority. The leadership of the movement was turned over to the Republicans.

Extensive hearings were held in 1926 and in 1927.

When the Democratic Party came into control of the House in 1932, a bill was introduced which undertook to lay a mandate on the Federal Reserve System and the Secretary of the Treasury to raise the general-commodity price level to the average existing between 1921 and 1929 and then maintain it at that point by the control of the credit and currency.

The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Banking and Currency and passed the House by a vote of 289 to 60.

When the bill got into the Senate an amendment was offered striking out the title and inserting what was then known as the Glass amendment, and which of course, as it was intended to do, rendered the bill absolutely useless for the purpose for which it was introduced.

By this time the people of the country had become very greatly interested in the subject of the stabilization of the currency, and in the question as to how the currency could be so handled as to furnish a maximum amount of efficiency to all branches of society. In 1934 a bill providing for an independent monetary authority was introduced in this House. Extensive hearings covering several weeks were held upon the bill by a subcommittee of seven, which subcommittee reported unanimously favorably to the full committee on the bill. The matter was taken up by the full committee with the administration and it was decided that the time was not ripe for serious consideration in this body of that proposed legislation; but in 1935 we find the basic principles contemplated by the monetary authority bill of 1934 embodied in the so-called "Banking Act of 1935." Instead of providing for an independent monetary authority, the so-called "Banking Act of 1935" provides that the Federal Reserve Board shall act as a monetary authority. What can they do? They can control the rediscount rates in their dealings with member banks. They can raise or lower the reserve requirements of member banks. They have complete control—after consultation with five governors of the Reserve banks—of the open-market operations of the Federal Reserve banks.

This bill provides for pensions for members of the Federal Reserve Board who have retired. If they have served 12 years they will get a salary of \$12,000 a year after they retire. If they have served 10 years, they will get a salary of \$10,000. If they have served 5 years, they will get a salary of \$5,000, but if they have served less than 5 years they will not get anything. They are appointed for 12 years. They can be removed only for cause. We changed the recommendation of the administration that when a man was appointed governor and was removed by the Executive as governor, he should cease to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board. Under the bill as reported he does not cease to be a member of the Board under those circumstances, after he is removed as governor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is not the provision of the bill putting this power in the Federal Reserve Board rather than setting up a monetary authority in line with what evidently is the intent and purpose of the act, which is the concentration of authority and responsibility in one agency representing the national interest. In other words, under the law as it is, is there not such diffusion of authority as to render impossible quick and direct action in case of emergency?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The gentleman has stated with a rare degree of accuracy the purpose of the part of the bill which he speaks. At this time the banks themselves practically control the monetary policy of the country, and this changes all that. That is what this racket is about, that is why the subsidized press tells us that there is something wrong with the bill. They call it a political bill. They say that we are setting up a political board.

It is exactly the opposite. These men are appointed for 12 years, but if they have served for 5 years they are pensioned after they retire. They cannot be removed at the whim of a President. What more independent board can you imagine than that? Now it is the Governors of the Federal Reserve banks who control the open-market policies of the Federal Reserve banks. This bill places their open-market policies under the control of an independent board, the Federal Reserve Board, which is not dependent at all upon the banks.

Mr. COX. One representing a special group of special interests, while the other represents society as a whole.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. SWEENEY. I think the gentleman is one of the finest students of the monetary question and probably has done as much as any man in this House in that direction. I supported his bill last year. It was a bill in the direction of reform in banking. That bill was defeated in the Senate by sources over which we had no control. I want to ask the gentleman a sincere and candid question. Is not the solution of our problem this: That this Congress ought to take its rights into its own hands and coin money and regulate the value thereof, and create a central bank and insist upon 100-percent reserves behind demand deposits? Is not that the solution?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. If I have time, I am going to refer to all of the matters of which the gentleman has spoken, but I am not ready to do it right now.

The American Bankers Association submitted a printed memorial to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. A special committee of the American Bankers' Association, consisting of R. S. Hecht, chairman of the board of the Hibernia National Bank in New Orleans; Robert V. Fleming, president of Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C.; Tom K. Smith, president of the Boatmen's National Bank of St. Louis; Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York; Ronald Ransom, executive vice president of the Fulton National Bank of Atlanta, Ga.

When the distinguished ranking member of the minority on the committee was speaking yesterday he criticized this proposed legislation on the ground that the Federal Reserve banks were private institutions, and that under this legislation they could be required by the Federal Reserve Board to so conduct their open-market operations as to be compelled to either buy or sell bonds, whether they wanted to or not. Now, let us see whether the American Bankers Association had the hardihood to make any such criticism. Private banks? Of course, the member banks were private banks; but member banks and the Federal Reserve banks have been in control of the people's medium of exchange, and when they began to close, because of the financial condition of the country, we set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to put them on their feet. They did not claim that they were immune to help at that time. They did not say, "We are private institutions and therefore we cannot take your money." They said, "We exercise a public function. It is our obligation to furnish the people the money whereby they

can transact the business of the country, and therefore we must be protected by the public, and the Treasury of the United States must be open to us."

That is what they said then. The Treasury of the United States was open to them, and for several years the stock of the banks of the country has been purchased by the people's money, furnished by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to keep them from closing. Why? Because they exercise a public function. They should not exercise it. That is what has destroyed the country. That is the thing that has created this depression; but they do exercise it. Therefore they cannot come here and say that the Congress of the United States shall not so control them as to safeguard the people's money from undue expansion and contraction. There is not a word in that memorial of the American Bankers Association to the Committee on Banking and Currency that criticizes such a policy.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman would yield to me for the purpose of quoting from the testimony of Mr. Eccles in the hearings on this bill, who himself was quoting another, and one for whom I confess I never had any great affection, but for whom justice rings tribute that he is possibly the greatest brain of the twentieth century, our great war President, Woodrow Wilson, who said in a message to the joint session of Congress in 1913:

The control of the system of banking and of issue must be vested in the Government itself, so that the banks may be the instruments, not the masters, of business and of individual enterprise and initiative.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman for his illuminating contribution.

Half of my time is gone. If it can be avoided, I would appreciate it if gentlemen withhold their interruptions and let me complete my statement.

Under the head of "Open Market Operations", this is what the American Bankers Association said to us:

Neither the original text of section 205, providing for the open-market committee of three members of the Federal Reserve Board and two governors of the Federal Reserve banks, nor the subsequent suggestion which has been made that authority over the open-market operations be vested in the Federal Reserve Board, which would be required to consult with a committee of 5 governors selected by the 12 governors before adopting an open-market policy, a change in discount rates or a change in member bank reserve requirements seems to constitute a satisfactory solution of the open-market problem.

Then, further:

Our suggestion is that the open-market committee shall consist of the entire Federal Reserve Board (reduced to 5 members) and 4 governors of the Federal Reserve banks, selected by the governors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks annually, each member of the open-market committee having a vote in the deliberations of the committee on the three subjects to be intrusted to it—i. e., open-market policy, change in discount rates, or change in member-bank reserve requirements.

You will see that while the American Bankers' Association suggests that the banks be represented on the open-market committee, they do not have the hardihood to say that the Government of the United States has no right to set up an open-market committee which shall control the purchase and sale of Government bonds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this country we are blessed, apparently, with what is known as a "Committee of Sixty." We had one member of this committee before the Committee on Banking and Currency. His name is Prof. Walter E. Sparr. He is apparently professor of economics in the University of New York. I find he is secretary-treasurer of the Economist National Committee on Monetary Policies. This will be interesting to you. The president of that organization is Edwin W. Kemmerer, professor of economics at Princeton University.

On the executive committee is Dr. H. Parker Willis, who is professor of banking at Columbia University and who was the adviser of the House Committee on Banking and Currency when the Federal Reserve Act was written, and who was Senator GLASS' adviser when the 1933 act was written.

Professor Sparr came before our committee and stated that in his judgment this committee of 60 knew more about the subject of money than anybody in the world. That was,

his opinion. We asked him what he would do about existing conditions. Oh, he would not do anything now; he would have a committee appointed to study the question and report in about a year; and that is as far as he got with constructive suggestions.

We then thought we would like to find out the opinion of the learned gentleman. We ascertained that he knew the Constitution of the United States stated that Congress had the duty imposed upon it to issue money and regulate its value, but when we pressed him he said that if they did issue money and regulate its value they would be guilty of forgery. That is his exact language, that if the Congress did what the Constitution of the United States stated it should do, it would be guilty of forgery; and he said it in half a dozen different ways, so that the wayfaring man, though he were a fool, could read and understand.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLISTER. I do not believe the gentleman from Maryland wanted to quote Professor Spahr incorrectly.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I could not do that; he went too far.

Mr. HOLLISTER. What Professor Spahr said was that when Congress issued money which had absolutely nothing behind it that then it was committing a forgery, because one of the definitions of forgery is the signing of a name to a valueless piece of paper.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Congress could not issue money with nothing behind it, because every sovereign power that issues money has behind it the wealth of every individual in the country. [Applause.] But he said in a half dozen different ways that unless Congress got its money by borrowing from some bank or by taxation—if it got its money in any way other than these two—it was guilty of forgery. That is what that statesman said.

Let us now see what this other apologist of the banking system said about the banks in a recent book that he published. I have the book in my office; I got it from the Library of Congress.

[From the New York American, Wednesday, Mar. 20, 1935]

#### DESTRUCTIVE POLITICS

By Robert H. Hemphill, financial authority

The introduction to H. Parker Willis' comprehensive new book, *The Banking Situation*, contains statements from this eminent authority of such vital significance that the high lights at least should be most widely published.

No one in the United States is more competent than Dr. Willis to speak upon these subjects. He has long been recognized as the leading financial authority sympathetic with, if not representative of, international banking sentiment of Wall Street.

His tutelage of and close association with the Honorable CARTER GLASS, formerly Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and later of the Senate, who more than anyone else of recent years has dominated the progress of financial legislation in the United States, enables Dr. Willis to speak with certainty of the political manipulation by which fundamental improvements in the banking-monetary system have been consistently prevented.

Dr. Willis says:

"For the past several years it has been evident, even to the casual students of banking and of the general industrial situation in the United States, that a fundamental reform or reorganization was inevitably necessary. The inadequacy of the American banking system to provide for the requirements of business has long been evident.

"The measures which were taken during the years 1931 and 1932, for the improvement of banking conditions, were entirely of the sort classified as 'relief', and in no case partook of reconstruction, reform, or improvement.

"The state of things revealed by the break-down of 1933 has shown that there is need for complete rectification and reconstruction even of the very foundations upon which the present-day banking system of the United States rests.

#### "BANKERS LACK VISION

"To those who recognize any measure of truth in the general indictment of the situation thus outlined, the question must naturally occur: Why is it that the United States, perhaps the wealthiest country in the world, perhaps also that country in which the widest distribution of income has taken place, should have suffered particularly from such adverse conditions?

"In most countries legislation on the subject of banking originates in one of two ways. It may, first of all, be proposed by the Administration of the country.

"In some other countries the banking community itself succeeds in exercising a general jurisdiction over the conditions that surround its own operations and has the wisdom from time to time to acquiesce in changes designed to give the public what

changes are demanded by circumstance even though such changes might not appear advantageous to the members of the banking community itself.

"In the United States we have not been willing to assent to either of these methods. American bankers have practically never been willing to agree among themselves about changes in banking laws.

"The American Bankers' Association has seldom, if ever, taken any position with regard to banking laws except to oppose or antagonize what was being proposed.

#### "MONEY TRUST REIGNS

"In other cases it has been obliged to admit the existence of a very representative minority, whose view was far from coinciding with that of the larger body of members.

"There is probably no country in the world in which there is a greater approach to the real existence of a so-called 'money trust' than in the United States. Nor is there any country in which there is less assurance of nonpartisanship and fairness in the extension of credit in banks to individuals or corporations.

"It is seldom that there can be any actually frank congressional debate about currency or banking questions. Most such discussions have been largely personal recrimination or an appeal to prejudice based on 'antitrust' and other allied ideas or an effort to stir up popular prejudice or imaginary fears of one sort or another.

"For many years it was the practice of the banking community to secure the 'pigeonholing' or ignoring of new legislation by the familiar methods of legislative obstruction and control.

#### "LEGISLATION IN CONGRESS

"When these forms of opposition lost their force or were unsuccessful, proposed changes of law were often either referred to committees around which special interests clustered, or they were made by legislators who were determined to prevent any further growth or development of arguments of the kind thus contemplated. In other cases such legislation was allowed to reach a fairly advanced stage, and then was called up for 'hearing' before some committee, at which time a joint onslaught by banking interests developed for the purpose not of improving or strengthening the legislation, but merely of rendering it ridiculous or at any rate unpopular, and of relegating it to the background."

Professor Willis' exposé is timely. Important banking legislation is now before the Banking and Currency Committees of both the House and the Senate. On its disposition hinges our hope of recovery and may hinge the fate of our Democracy.

That is what this gentleman who is now apologizing for the state of the banking system, who says that we are all wrong in what we are trying to do, thought of the banks when he wrote his book.

Now, let us see what Professor Kemmerer, who is the president of this organization, thought of what we were trying to do a few years ago. In December of 1927 Professor Kemmerer, who for years had been professor of economics at Princeton University, made this statement:

The world sooner or later must either learn how to stabilize the gold standard or devise some other monetary standard to take its place. There is probably no defect in this economic organization today more serious than the fact that we use as our unit of value not a thing with a fixed value, but a fixed weight of gold with a widely varying value. In a little less than a half a century here in the United States we have seen our yardstick of value, namely, the value of a gold dollar, exhibit the following gyrations: From 1879 to 1896 it rose 27 percent; from 1896 to 1920 it fell 70 percent; from 1920 to September 1927 it rose 56 percent. If, figuratively speaking, we say that the yardstick value was 36 inches long in 1879, when the United States returned to the gold standard, then it was 46 inches long in 1896, 13½ inches long in 1920, and is 21 inches long today.

That is what Professor Kemmerer thought of our monetary system controlled by the banks in 1927; but now he has become 1 of the 60, one of the anointed who are going to have a commission appointed to report a year from now on what may be done. Every day my mail is filled with letters from business houses, from people who evidently know nothing about the subject but who have been told by their bankers to follow the advice of Professor Kemmerer and write to their Congressmen that they want a nice little commission appointed to report on this subject 1 year from now.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible in the time allotted to me, and properly allotted, because there are other members on the committee who can throw great light on this question, to cover the points I would like to. I do want to call attention to an amendment which I shall introduce when the proper point in the bill is reached. The amendment reads as follows:

On page 51, after line 10, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(c) Section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the average purchasing power of the dollar, as ascertained by the Department of Labor in the wholesale commodity markets for the period covering the years 1921 to 1929, inclusive, shall be promptly restored; and that after such restoration shall have been achieved the purchasing power of the dollar shall be maintained substantially stable in relation to a suitable index of basic commodity prices which the Federal Reserve Board shall cause to be compiled and published in complete detail at weekly intervals.

"The Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Reserve banks, and the Secretary of the Treasury are hereby charged with the duty of making effective this policy. To this end it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to establish or cause to be established in the United States a free and open market in which gold and silver may be bought and sold for use, investment, or trade, and to determine, without limitations, and with the advice of the Federal Reserve Board, the amounts and the prices at which the Treasury shall buy and sell gold and silver.

"Acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the terms of this subsection are hereby repealed."

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what does the committee think of his amendment?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The gentleman means the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. FIESINGER. Yes.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I cannot say; I do not know. I was not able to secure a majority vote, but whether or not a majority thought it was a good amendment is a very different proposition.

Mr. FIESINGER. I had in mind to ask the gentleman a question or two, but I did not want to interrupt him. Now that he has read this amendment, I want to tell him what I have in mind. The gentleman spoke about the stabilization of our money. Does not the gentleman mean, in fact, the stabilization of the price level of commodities?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I have no objection to that statement; I think it is correct and means the same thing as my statement.

Mr. FIESINGER. If this be the purpose and object, then we are going to leave that question up to the Advisory Board, are we not? They are the manipulators of the stability of the money and the purchasing power of money and of commodities.

If we do that, what assurance have we that they, being between the conflict of money and property and the producers of commodities, will take the side of producers of commodities against money and property? The gentleman is trying to cure that by this amendment, and that is the reason I asked the question whether the committee was in favor of the amendment.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I can only guess. If I was guessing, I would say the majority was in favor of it, but I do not know that definitely, and they have not said so to me.

Mr. FIESINGER. Why was that not put in the bill then?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. There are practical men on the committee, and their judgment might be better than mine.

Mr. FIESINGER. I do not know much about this amendment, but I repeat the question, What assurance have we, if this bill is passed, that those in control of the Federal Reserve System will not manipulate things in the interest of the purchasing power of money as against the purchasing power of commodities?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Does the gentleman mean without some mandate?

Mr. FIESINGER. Without some mandate. Will they not look at it from the interest and standpoint of the bankers, because all of them are bankers?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I think this amendment will control the situation.

Mr. FIESINGER. I think the gentleman and I are agreed on one thing, and that is if we are going to pay our debts contracted when commodities were a great deal higher than they are now, we will have to have a higher price level.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This is a very important question, in view of the gentleman's statement and the amendment which he is going to offer. I understood the gentleman was attacking Professor Kemmerer and his theory we ought to have a gold base for our currency?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. No; I was not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. At the same time the gentleman's amendment, as I understand it, creates a free and open market for the purchase and sale of gold and silver. What affiliation is there between the gold standard and the purchase and sale of gold in a free market under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. After the 1921-29 level is restored, then the index number shall be fixed at that point, solely in reference to basic commodity prices as they exist at that time. The international medium of exchange up to this time has been gold, and as long as it is gold, these basic commodities enter into international trade and the raising or lowering of the price of gold will raise or lower the price of these commodities. Reason not only tells me that, but I can prove it mathematically if given the time. I could demonstrate that that has been the course of the prices of basic commodities.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How does the gentleman's amendment differ from the policy which we have already established of giving the President the power to devalue the gold and raise or lower the value of a dollar to the point where the commodity price index will be at the 1926 level. It will be stabilized.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. There are two answers to the gentleman's question. One is that the President has adopted the policy of fixing the price of gold and not allowing it to raise or lower in a free market. The other answer is that that legislation was purely emergency legislation, while this amendment undertakes to write permanent law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman will realize that I have been sympathetic with the program and I am asking these questions merely to draw out the differences that might be in the minds of some of the Members.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I will list the basic commodities I have in mind: Hides, rubber, linseed oil, turpentine, petroleum, copper, lead, zinc, tin, silver, cotton, print cloth, wool, silk, burlap, sugar, coffee, cocoa, eggs, butter, cheese, flour, beef, pork, lard, wheat, corn, oats, rye, and barley. That list, of course, is subject to variation but it is substantially what would compose a basic commodity index.

May I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan to the fact the latter part of this amendment states that with the advice of the Federal Reserve Board the Secretary of the Treasury can determine without limitation the amount and price at which the Treasury shall buy and sell gold. In other words, while gold will be on a free market generally, if it became necessary either to raise or lower the index number, the Secretary of the Treasury would have authority to go into the market and buy gold in order to raise the price of gold and so raise the price of the basic commodities, or to sell gold in order to lower the price.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Has the gentleman defined the exact policy and course of operations that is to be binding upon this Federal Reserve Board? I just ask the gentleman that question; and if so, where?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. May I say that I have found in an experience of some few years I cannot get everything I want. Very often I cannot even approximate it. The amendment which I am offering is the composite judgment of several groups. It is the very best we can get, and we feel it is immeasurably better than anything we now have, and I am very hopeful we can secure the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. I am sorry, but that is not the question. I want to know if the gentleman or the committee has defined the exact policy and course of operations that is to be binding upon the Federal Reserve Board; and if so, where is it included in the bill? If it is not, just say so. I do not ask the gentleman to create anything. Is it there or is it not there?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The gentleman means in the bill or in the amendment?

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. In your bill, if it is there, or assuming it is there, have you provided any mandates to compel the enforcement or observance of that polar-star gold, or have you provided any restraints or restrictions or any prohibitions against this Board doing something it should not do; and if so, where is it in the bill?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I have attempted, as I said before, to draw an amendment which would constitute a mandate. There is, however, a statement on page 51 of the bill which says:

(c) It shall be the duty of the Federal Reserve Board to exercise such powers as it possesses in such manner as to promote conditions conducive to business stability and to mitigate by its influence unstabilizing fluctuations in the general level of production, trade, prices, and employment, so far as may be possible within the scope of monetary action and credit administration.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Will the gentleman explain wherein that clause defines any policy or provides for any mandate or provides for any prohibition that would in any way control or direct the Federal Reserve Board or change the course of the Federal Reserve Board in the future from what it has observed in the past? Show me any word or any line or any provision anywhere in the bill. I cannot find it myself, but I may be wrong.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. It is intended, I may say to the gentleman from Indiana, to do this—

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. I am not talking about what is intended. I want to know what is in the bill and where it is in the bill.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I have read it to the gentleman and I am going to tell you what the purpose is. The purpose of the language is to direct the attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the fact that under this bill it is given practical control of the monetary affairs of this country, and that being so, they must exercise it in the interest of the public and not in the interest of the banks.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Just one more question. Where in the bill is there provided any assurance that the Federal Reserve Board you are appointing will do what is necessary to be done?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not know whether we will have angels on the Federal Reserve Board or not. If we do, they will be an entirely different class of people from those we have anywhere else.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. We have had all other kinds, and it is time we were having some angels.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to state that this bill provides that the members of the Board, after they have served for 12 years at \$12,000 a year, receiving a total of \$144,000, are to be pensioned for the rest of their lives at \$12,000 a year?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Yes; that is correct; and I may say, furthermore, if they do what they should do they will be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the struggling masses of the people of this country every year they work. [Applause.]

Mr. ENGEL. How about after they quit working?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The idea is this: If you put a man of middle age on this Board and keep him there for 12 years or more and he devotes his entire time to it, when he leaves the Board he simply cannot get a job, that is all; and if he is going to do his work right, he ought to know he is not going to go on the bread line when he leaves.

Mr. ENGEL. I was thinking about the \$15 a month that we are giving other people on the other end of the line.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I did not come here to make a demagogic speech.

Mr. ENGEL. Neither did I.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Or to answer demagogic questions.

Mr. ENGEL. But I did make a statement that is pertinent.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not consider that a proper question to inject into this discussion, and therefore I shall not answer it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe my friend will agree with me that the Federal Reserve agent under the present set-up is the most important official connected with a Federal Reserve bank and that this Federal Reserve agent can call up the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and get money printed, and so forth. Under this bill the Federal Reserve agent's title is changed to that of governor. Under existing law the Federal Reserve Board can appoint this individual, but under this proposed bill the Federal Reserve banks' directors will appoint him. Does not the gentleman think that should be changed, putting it back to where it is now, so that the Federal Reserve Board can appoint the man who will have charge of the Federal Reserve bank?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. It is not intended that the governor of the Federal Reserve bank shall be the Federal Reserve agent.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Reserve agent is abolished under this law; that is, the title of "Federal Reserve agent" is abolished.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I understand that, but it is not intended that the governor of the Federal Reserve bank shall take over the duties of the Federal Reserve agent.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman sure about that?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Oh, yes; I am absolutely certain about it.

Mr. PATMAN. Who is going to perform those duties?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. They can appoint anybody to do that; and let me tell the gentleman the history involved.

I started out by saying in my opening remarks that the banks had perverted the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. PATMAN. And I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. All right. There is not a word in the Federal Reserve Act that provides for a governor of a Federal Reserve bank.

Mr. PATMAN. That is true; but listen—

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Just a minute. There is a provision that the Federal Reserve Board shall appoint a chairman of the board of each Federal Reserve bank. The banks simply went to work and they practically abolished the chairman of the board, who does have a place in the law, and appointed a governor themselves, without the slightest justification in the world for it.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a violation of the law, I agree.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Of course it is a violation of the law.

Mr. PATMAN. Then why should we condone it by enacting into law something that is absolutely wrong? We do, in this law, what the gentleman says the bank itself should not do.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. No; they can elect their own governor under this act, but he has to be approved by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. PATMAN. I understand that, but the banks will not submit a name that is not satisfactory to the banks and the Federal Reserve Board only has veto power, and, surely, the banks will select the one they want for that place and have charge of the matter.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not think so at all. As a matter of fact, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, while this legislation, of course, theoretically speaking, could be improved upon, if we are able to pass this bill through the House and through the Senate, in my opinion, it will be the greatest advance in economic legislation that has ever taken place in the history of the world.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with my friend, but let me ask one other question about the open-market operations.

I thought the Federal Reserve Board, under this bill, would appoint the committee and control the open-market operations, but I notice from this report that the governors of these banks will appoint that committee, and the governors of the banks are selected by the directors.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The gentleman is wrong about that. The Federal Reserve Board is the open-market committee, and they are only required to consult with the committee of five appointed by the banks themselves.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an advisory committee?

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Certainly. [Applause.]

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is all right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the most important question that will ever come before this or any other Congress is a question that is involved in this bill. That question is, Shall the Government of the United States control the money and credit of the Government, or shall the private banking interests control the Government? While the present bill does not present the question squarely on all fours, yet, in discussing this bill, we cannot avoid discussing this real issue.

We can appropriate money in billion for relief, we can pass moratoriums, we can defer tax deeds, we can refinance every class in the United States; and yet, if we fail to restore this Government to the people who compose it; if we fail to take possession of our own money and our own credit; if we fail to say to private banking interests you must now surrender the stranglehold you now have on the people of this country in unconscionable interest rates, and withdrawn credit; if we fail to drive those private banking interests out of the control of the Government itself, we shall have failed in our duty to the American people.

Gentlemen of this House, this is not a political question. The power of private banking interests is not to be measured by party lines. The bond which through the years were formed by the association and combination of private banking interests is stronger than party; it is the strongest tie every developed on this continent. I have heretofore shown that in the great Northwest the people have been and now are at the mercy of an unscrupulous banking system, organized under the banner of the Northwest Bancorporation and the First Bank Stock Corporation. These two holding companies have gained control of the best financial institutions of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan, parts of Wisconsin and Iowa. With an investment of \$1,000 the Northwest Bancorporation sold \$50,000,000 in stock to the people of the Northwest, and through this spurious and worthless stock financed the purchase of the best banks in the States named. Not content with that, this institution, together with its criminal sister, the First Bank Stock Corporation, has gained control of every Government finance agency located in the Northwest for the relief of the people financially.

Today, in the Twin Cities, they control the Federal land bank, the intermediate credit bank, the Federal Reserve bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and every other Government institution intended to grant financial relief to the people. Who controls these institutions? Can the Democratic administration control them? Who does control them? The answer is that private banking interests are powerful enough to keep control. They gained control through the administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and the Democratic administration bureau chief keeps the same men in control.

We hear great alarms being sounded by the private bankers to this effect, "Don't let the banks be politically controlled." No; they would have you leave control where it is—in the hands of the "money power." Why do they want to control these institutions? Simply because they want to use them. I have shown in former speeches to the Congress how they are using the institutions of the Government for their own private interests.

When the Federal Reserve Act was introduced in Congress, it was intended and designed to break the power of the private bankers, who were able to create a "money panic" any time they desired one. I hold in my hand a copy of the original Federal Reserve Act, which I shall designate as exhibit 1; I hold in my other hand the act as it came from the committee of the private bankers of America, which I will designate as exhibit 2. Examining exhibit 2 you will notice the bill has many provisions which have been stricken out; you will also notice it has many new provisions written in in red ink. That was done by the private bankers. I now

pick up the law as passed, known as the "Federal Reserve Act", which I will designate as exhibit 3. Now compare these documents. What law was passed? The law as introduced or the law the private bankers wrote? Look at exhibit 2—the private bankers' changed bill—and you will see that it is the act that was passed with very few minor changes.

This completes the argument and proof that the Federal Reserve Act intended to control the power of private bankers to initiate panics, was, after all, left in control of the very men against whom it was intended as a check. What other proof do we have—worlds of it—on the advisory council were 12 men, one appointed by each of the 12 Reserve banks. J. P. Morgan represented the New York district, district no. 2, and when the councilmen met in Washington in October 1914, J. P. Morgan was elected chairman of the advisory committee of the Federal Reserve System. In other words, the whole policy of the system was placed in the hands of the "private bankers" before a single bank was opened. It is, in fact, the same old private system operating under a semi-Government endorsement, to take away the curse of private control, which had become obnoxious to the American people.

Can this famed Federal Reserve System bring on panics? Decidedly yes. It did this very thing. The present depression in this country was precipitated by the Federal Reserve Board at the meeting in Washington on May 18, 1920. We were at peace with the world—there were no internal strikes or disorders. Everything was moving ahead orderly. This Board deliberately and criminally determined to put a stop to orderly business. The credit that had been extended they demanded to be paid. Credit was withdrawn, and in order to pay, our grain, our cotton, our corn, our tobacco, our lands were sacrificed. As soon as the great agricultural population were left moneyless, there ceased to be a buying factor in our national business. When this buying power was destroyed, the manufacturing centers lost their customers and, having lost an outlet for their goods, they were forced to shut their plants down, and it was then that the millions went out of employment. It should be self-evident that this Reserve System, when it was most needed, failed to function for the American people.

How does the system work? It is a private system. The Government does not own a dollar of the stock of the Federal Reserve banks. The Government makes nothing, and can make nothing, until such time as the banks are liquidated. The profits now go into buildings (capital investments), salaries, and reserves. The surplus and profits will not come into the Government control under the law until a bank is liquidated. Annually the member banks get their dividends. Salaries which are unconscionable are paid to officers.

But what do these banks get from the Government in return for actually nothing. They get the use of Government cash and Government credit for nothing and loan that money out, and 10 times that amount, and draw interest on the whole credit system. They also draw interest on the bonds placed with the Government as security for currency. The Federal Reserve Board has issued approximately \$4,000,000,000 in Government currency for which the Government is paid no interest. What is behind this issue? Mostly the Government's own bonds, drawing interest at 3½ percent. The private system, therefore, collects the interest on the bonds deposited and on 10 times the amount of the cash received from the Government. This system buys the Government bonds and pays the Government how? They give the United States Government a credit on the banks' books, and the Government is permitted to draw checks on a fund created by the Government's own money and credit. The Government pays 3½-percent interest on its own money handed over to the private-bankers system to use.

It is comparatively simple to see this operation. Those who desire to continue this system always say, "Now, this money question is a very deep and complicated matter, and only a few men understand it." As a matter of fact, it is not deep, and it is not complicated, if we will only stop to dissect it and bring the inner contents to the light of day.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. There has been a great deal of talk about the Government in private business. Does not the gentleman think we should take the bankers out of Government business?

Mr. BURDICK. If we are to continue as the greatest nation in the world it should be done at once.

Is there any Member in the House who, with logic, can say that we should continue a system by which this Government pays interest on its own money and credit? Is there any just reason why the United States should not finance itself instead of financing the private banking racketeers of the country? Is there any reason why the private banking interests of the country should control the destiny of the American people? Is there any just reason why these private banking interests should control our Government? It would be a grand experiment to let the people have just one opportunity to operate their Government. There would not be such a demand that the Government be destroyed and a new one set up if we would give the people, for once, a chance to see how their own Government would work in their own hands. In my judgment, we have the best form of Government ever set up on this earth, and to destroy it would be to lose our fight for freedom for a thousand years. We know how powerful the money interests have become; we know they should not control this Government; we know we should control it; and the one and only way to control it is to drive those private interests, who control it financially, out of the councils of our Government.

When we say "establish a bank of the United States" immediately goes out the false statements that we tried that twice—once in 1790 and again in 1816. I submit that we never had a Bank of the United States. We had institutions called that, but the Government never owned or controlled the stock and never controlled the banks. In the first bank the capital stock was ten million and the Government subscribed two million, and the rest was private. In the second bank the capital stock was thirty-five million and seven million subscribed by the United States. The balance was private. In both cases private interest managed and controlled the banks. They were nothing more, or very little more, than our present Reserve System. We at least had some stock in them then. But those banks, managed by the "money crowd" started panics and manipulated stock sales and threatened the stability of the country's business. It took a great patriot like Andrew Jackson to smash their system and drive them out of control of the destiny of the American people. We can never pay to Andrew Jackson the tribute that is due him for smashing this system.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLISTER. I do not understand the purport of the gentleman's argument. I understood the gentleman to be arguing for the Government to take over this system, and the thing that Andrew Jackson objected to was the Government control of the banking system. The gentleman is blowing hot and blowing cold.

Mr. BURDICK. So far as I am concerned, I am blowing hot. [Laughter.] The reason why Jackson drove the money changers out of the temple was because the speculators in the bank were destroying the credit structure of the Nation. Private interests owned and controlled the bank. The Government only had seven million of the thirty-five million stock.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Andrew Jackson objected to the Government controlling the banking situation.

Mr. BURDICK. I would like to conform to the gentleman's view, but I cannot change history. We need another Andrew Jackson now.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. I think the gentleman is actually correct in his matter of history.

Mr. BURDICK. We need another Andrew Jackson now. We need to smash the Federal Reserve System. We need to build a bank of the United States, owned and all by the United States, operated by the United States for the people of the United States. Why should we bankrupt this Government paying interest on bonds of the Government, when we do

not need bonds? Issue new money by the new bank under the power granted to Congress by the Constitution, pay off these bonds, and stop this contribution to private bankers that has actually bankrupted the Nation and everyone in it. Today we owe, public and private, over \$290,000,000,000, and all of our property in existence is not worth 50 percent of what we owe. This annual interest charge is more than the combined income for agriculture and labor (1933-34).

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FIESINGER. I understood the gentleman to say that one of the objectionable things the Federal Board did to the farmers in 1920 was when they contracted the currency.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. What is there in this bill that would prevent a similar occurrence? Can the gentleman point it out specifically?

Mr. BURDICK. I think if the gentleman will reserve that question until I get through, the question will be answered. If I have time, I will answer it, but maybe I shall cover the question. I have no intention of trying to avoid the answer to any question that I can answer.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman supporting the bill as it is?

Mr. BURDICK. The same reply applies to the gentleman's question as to the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FIESINGER]. If the gentleman will wait a moment, he will see what I think of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman think it is a good step in the right direction—a good, long one?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. I am satisfied that the Democratic administration is not powerful enough to remove the Coolidge-Hoover operators of the Government finance institutions. I am satisfied that the "private money group" of the Nation is now stronger than the Democratic administration and that the administration will have to sit idly by and see Republicans operate these institutions. The whole system must be smashed and the private banking interests driven out of the councils of this Government if this Government is to endure. As a patriotic American citizen, I believe in defending this country; I believe in driving its enemies out—and the greatest, the most deadly enemy this country has today is the private control of Government money and Government credit. Restore this power to the people; remove this unbearable interest burden which is making our citizens despondent; restore to Congress its power to issue money; and let us, in the name of Jefferson, Lincoln, and Jackson, restore this great Government to the people, where it belongs.

The present bill is a step in the right direction—it does not go far enough. But in the absence of an opportunity to vote for the immediate dissolution of the Federal Reserve System I will support the bill.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. KENNEY. The gentleman referred in his address to banks to be operated for the people by the Government. Would there be any objection on the gentleman's part to having the people themselves through their merchants operate the banks of the country? I might say in that connection that in Italy the banks are governmentally controlled, and in Germany we have the same thing, but, as I understand it, in France and England there are banks that are controlled not by the private bankers, as in this country, but by the people through their merchants. I wonder if the gentleman has considered these different phases of the situation?

Mr. BURDICK. I am in favor of any system whatever that will give the people a chance to run the finance business of the country. We have delayed that too long.

I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a table prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury showing just what money is in circulation, what kind of money, and the bonds and fractional currency.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the table will be incorporated as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

There was no objection.

The table I referred to, Mr. Chairman, is as follows:

## Circulation statement of United States money, Oct. 31, 1933

Kind of money	Total amount	Money held in the Treasury					Money outside of the Treasury				Population of continental United States (estimated)
		Total	Amount held in trust against gold and silver certificates (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Reserve against United States notes (and Treasury notes of 1890)	Held for Federal Reserve banks and agents	All other money	Total	Held by Federal Reserve banks and agents <sup>1</sup>	In circulation <sup>2</sup>		
									Amount	Per capita	
Gold coin and bullion.....	<sup>3</sup> \$4,323,136,335	\$3,197,292,684	\$1,177,069,999	\$156,039,088	\$1,787,342,966	\$76,840,631	\$1,125,843,651	\$813,889,365	\$311,954,286	\$2.48	
Gold certificates.....	<sup>4</sup> (1,177,069,999)						1,177,069,999	952,444,120	224,625,879	1.78	
Standard silver dollars.....	540,007,398	506,961,702	478,260,122			28,701,580	33,045,696	4,511,932	28,533,764	.23	
Silver certificates.....	<sup>4</sup> (477,063,498)						477,063,498	89,723,679	387,339,819	3.07	
Treasury notes of 1890.....	<sup>4</sup> (1,196,624)						1,196,624		1,196,624	.01	
Subsidiary silver.....	299,110,936	10,262,876				10,262,876	288,848,060	21,462,708	267,385,352	2.12	
Minor coin.....	126,761,246	5,478,139				5,478,139	121,283,107	5,632,488	115,650,619	.92	
United States notes.....	346,681,016	3,595,897				3,595,897	343,085,119	66,456,950	276,628,169	2.20	
Federal Reserve notes.....	3,225,890,600	17,566,885				17,566,885	3,208,323,715	278,177,680	2,930,146,035	23.26	
Federal Reserve bank notes.....	219,970,233	1,557,125				1,557,125	218,413,103	29,887,120	188,525,988	1.50	
National-bank notes.....	961,548,135	21,305,383				21,305,383	940,242,752	37,026,144	902,616,608	7.16	
Total Oct. 31, 1933.....	10,043,105,899	<sup>5</sup> 53,764,020,691	1,655,330,121	156,039,088	1,787,342,966	<sup>6</sup> 165,308,516	7,934,415,329	2,299,812,186	5,634,603,143	44.73	125,983,000
Comparative totals:											
Sept. 30, 1933.....	10,024,117,386	<sup>3</sup> 3,761,497,337	1,657,060,825	156,039,088	1,783,383,616	165,013,808	7,919,680,874	2,299,766,758	5,649,914,116	44.87	125,911,000
Oct. 31, 1932.....	9,367,601,015	<sup>3</sup> 3,595,167,544	1,834,576,689	156,039,088	1,471,387,067	133,164,700	7,607,010,160	1,979,428,886	5,627,581,274	44.98	<sup>7</sup> 125,112,000
Oct. 31, 1920.....	8,479,620,824	<sup>3</sup> 2,436,864,530	718,674,378	152,979,026	1,212,360,791	352,850,336	6,761,430,672	1,063,216,080	5,698,214,612	53.21	107,096,005
Mar. 31, 1917.....	5,396,596,677	<sup>3</sup> 2,952,020,313	2,681,691,072	152,979,026		117,350,216	5,126,267,436	953,321,522	4,172,945,914	40.23	103,716,000
June 30, 1914.....	3,797,825,099	<sup>3</sup> 1,845,569,804	1,507,178,879	150,000,000		188,390,925	3,450,434,174		3,450,434,174	34.93	99,027,000
Jan. 1, 1879.....	1,007,084,483	<sup>3</sup> 212,420,402	21,602,640	100,000,000		90,817,762	816,266,721		816,266,721	16.92	48,231,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes money held by the Cuban agency of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.<sup>2</sup> The money in circulation includes any paper currency held outside the continental limits of the United States.<sup>3</sup> Does not include gold bullion or foreign coin other than that held by the Treasury, Federal Reserve banks, and Federal Reserve agents. Gold held by Federal Reserve banks under earmark for foreign account is excluded, and gold held abroad for Federal Reserve banks is included.<sup>4</sup> These amounts are not included in the total since the money held in trust against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 is included under gold coin and bullion and standard silver dollars, respectively.<sup>5</sup> The amount of money held in trust against gold and silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 should be deducted from this total before combining it with total money outside of the Treasury to arrive at the stock of money in the United States.<sup>6</sup> This total includes \$37,312,767 gold deposited for the redemption of Federal Reserve notes (\$1,315,640 in process of redemption), \$39,074,679 lawful money deposited for the redemption of national bank notes (\$21,234,387 in process of redemption, including notes chargeable to the retirement fund), \$11,699,650 lawful money deposited for the redemption of Federal Reserve bank notes (\$1,557,122 in process of redemption, including notes chargeable to the retirement fund); \$1,350 lawful money deposited for the retirement of additional circulation (act of May 30, 1908), and \$59,295,582 lawful money deposited as a reserve for Postal Savings deposits.<sup>7</sup> Revised figures.

NOTE.—Gold certificates are secured dollar for dollar by gold held in the Treasury for their redemption; silver certificates are secured dollar for dollar by standard silver dollars held in the Treasury for their redemption; United States notes are secured by a gold reserve of \$156,039,088 held in the Treasury. This reserve fund may also be used for the redemption of Treasury notes of 1890, which are also secured dollar for dollar by standard silver dollars held in the Treasury; these notes are being canceled and retired on receipt. Federal Reserve notes are obligations of the United States and a first lien on all the assets of the issuing Federal Reserve bank. Federal Reserve notes are secured by the deposit with Federal Reserve agents of a like amount of gold or of gold and such discounted or purchased paper as is eligible under the terms of the Federal Reserve Act, or, until Mar. 3, 1934, of direct obligations of the United States if so authorized by a majority vote of the Federal Reserve Board. Federal Reserve banks must maintain a gold reserve of at least 40 percent, including the gold redemption fund which must be deposited with the United States Treasurer, against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Federal Reserve bank notes are secured by direct obligations of the United States or commercial paper, except where lawful money has been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for their retirement. National-bank notes are secured by United States bonds except where lawful money has been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for their retirement. A 5-percent fund is also maintained in lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for the redemption of national-bank notes secured by Government bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. The statement the gentleman has presumes that all the money ever issued is outstanding and in circulation today?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. It included all. Almost half a billion dollars has been sunk in the ocean, burned up in buildings, but still they say it is in circulation. If you need any of it, you have got to dive to the bottom of the ocean to get it.

Mr. PATMAN. I suppose the gentleman is aware that more than \$262,000,000 of the old bills, the large bills, remain in circulation today?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. O'CONNOR having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WOODRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7617, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ASHBROOK, for 2 days, on account of death in family.

THE FEDERAL LAND BANK OF ST. PAUL, MINN., UNDER THE INFLUENCE AND CONTROL OF OFFICERS FAVORABLE TO THE TWIN CITY BANK HOLDING COMPANIES, HAS BEEN MISMANAGED—A FULL INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY MADE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on March 18 I set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the present officers of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, including their political affiliation and prior banking record. In my speech before this House on March 14 I fully set forth the connection of the officers of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul with the Twin City banks, operated under the holding companies known as the "Northwest Bancorporation" and the "First Bank Stock Corporation." In all of these speeches, covering the period from March 14 to March 20, inclusive, I presented proof of the fact that all Government set-ups intended for the financial relief of the Northwest were now, and had been from the very beginning, under the control of officers connected with or formerly connected with these holding companies.

I further showed that in many cases, and particularly in the case of the War Finance Corporation, these same men, who for years have directed the affairs of these Government finance agencies, used these agencies for the private benefit of the institutions with which they were or had been connected. At that time I did not have complete evidence of mismanagement. Since I delivered those speeches referred to, evidence of mismanagement has been trickling through to me from individuals now on the inside of those institutions but whose names I cannot divulge. Should I here publish the source of my information, two things would happen: First, I would get no further information; second, these individuals would be summarily dismissed from their present positions.

I had hoped that the Democratic administration would act upon the information which I have heretofore presented and that many of the officers in charge of these Government finance institutions would be removed. I had hoped that when I had shown, for example, that Roy A. Nelson, president of the Federal land bank in St. Paul, had formerly been associated with the Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis, and the Northwest Bancorporation was a Republican and former receiver of the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank, that the administration might see its way clear to change officers. Nothing of the sort happened, and, as far as I know, Roy A. Nelson is still the president of the Federal land bank.

The point has now been reached where I ask more than the removal of this officer—I now ask for an immediate investi-

gation into the affairs of the bank to find out in just what way Nelson and his financial friends in the Twin Cities have personally profited by his conduct of the bank. That he has profited by his conduct of the bank, I now charge; but to what extent and to what extent others have become involved, I do not know. The following facts are certain:

At the time of Roy A. Nelson's appointment as president of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul he was receiver of the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank. His appointment as the bank president was approved by Henry Morgenthau, then Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Morgenthau must have been fully aware of Nelson's former connection with the Twin Cities bank gang. But, of course, there are no political considerations among the "money fraternity." Nelson was satisfactory to the "money crowd" and evidently that satisfied Morgenthau, who was personally on the ground when the appointment was approved.

The Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank had, while a going concern, executed a bond issue and which issue evidently was sold to various persons in and around the Twin Cities. When this institution went into receivership, the bonds were reduced in value. Nelson and his financial friends bought up as many of these bonds as could be purchased and obtained them at a price as low as 7 cents on the dollar. While still owning these bonds, Nelson was appointed president of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul.

The next move was to have Perry Johnson, formerly connected with the Minnesota Loan & Trust Co., dominated by the Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis, named as assistant to Roy A. Nelson.

Nelson then appointed a special loan committee to handle applications coming in for loans on lands which were then held by the Southern Minnesota Joint-Stock Land Bank. Title was secured by foreclosure, and Nelson, as receiver, had been in charge of those lands.

This committee time after time approved loans on lands held by the joint-stock land bank in amounts in excess of the value of the lands offered as security, and such loans were actually made. Not only were these loans made, but the applications were signed by men who were at the time renters and never had made any claim to the lands until after the loans were approved.

As the money started coming in from these loans approved by Nelson on lands over which Nelson had been receiver and in which he was then interested by holding bonds against said defunct corporation, the value of the bonds increased. Nelson and his friends began selling their 7-cent bonds for as much as 28 to 35 cents, and at some stage of the proceedings the receiver of the joint-stock land bank declared a dividend of 35 percent. This information must have reached Washington, for the evidence discloses that Nelson sold all of his interests—that is, his visible interests—in the bonds of the joint-stock land bank.

I give here just a few of the cases indicating mismanagement. After being informed of the nature of this mismanagement, I had the matter fully investigated on my own accord, and from the report, which agrees with the records, I find the following facts:

A loan was made to one Amelsburg on 160 acres for the amount of \$5,400. The land at the time the loan was approved was carried among the assets of the joint-stock land bank under a foreclosure for \$4,850. At the time the loan was made Amelsburg was a renter on that farm. The loan was dated December 4, 1934, but the deed from the joint-stock land bank to Amelsburg was not executed until February 27, 1935. The consideration in this deed was \$4,850 and taxes. It is evident that the loan on this land was approved by Nelson for the full if not more than the full value of the land.

Another loan was made under similar circumstances to another renter named Bahr for the sum of \$8,200 on 480 acres of land in Stevens County. This land was owned by the joint-stock bank through foreclosure and carried with a value of \$7,600. The applications for the loans were dated June 1, 1934. The loan was divided, as in the Amelsburg case, as follows: Land bank, \$4,500; Commissioner's

loan, \$3,700. Bahr never received a deed from the joint-stock land bank until September 18, 1934.

Fred Seamans owned a farm 1 mile south of the two farms mentioned. He had lived on his land there for 40 years. This farm consisted of 160 acres, on which he had an indebtedness of \$4,200. Seamans applied to the Federal land bank for a loan to save his home. He offered the same kind of security as that offered by the renter, Amelsburg, who had received a loan of \$5,400. But the land bank refused to make any kind of loan to Mr. Seamans and as far as the record speaks Seamans has lost his land.

I have further cases, but these three examples will be sufficient to show that Nelson and his Federal land bank committee approved loans, and excessive loans, on land in which the joint-stock land bank was interested and whose stock Nelson and his friends bought, while a legitimate farmer and actual owner was turned away from the bank as an undesirable and was told that the Government could not aid him in his hour of distress.

As a part of this speech, I desire to attach the report which I have had checked with the records in support of the statements herein made.

There is no question, in my mind, but what the Farm Credit Administration has had some knowledge of this matter, but they have retained Nelson. They have full information now as to the personal use which the officers of that bank are making of a Government finance institution, intended and presumed to be an instrument through which farmers may save their homes. How much more proof will the Farm Credit Administration demand before they dismiss Nelson and cause a complete investigation to be made of the affairs of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul. This information does not startle me in the least for I am convinced, beyond any reasonable doubt, that these Government finance agencies have not been cornered and controlled by the Twin City Bank gang for nothing. They have used them, they are using them, they will continue to use them for their own personal benefit and for the benefit of the institutions with which they are or have been connected. It is the same old story as is told by their operation of the War Finance Corporation, the Federal Reserve bank, or any other institution with which they have had any connection.

Just how long will the Democratic administration continue the deal? Is the "money crowd" so entrenched that no party can get rid of them? Are the bureau chiefs here at Washington a part of the same "money fraternity"? Is there a comradeship through the association of men in the high-standard banking profession that is strong enough to ride through all administrations, and defy Republicans and Democrats alike? These same men are the ones who shout in their newspapers, "You never want to let politics enter into the control of our finances." It would be a godsend to the American people if politics did enter and drive these conniving money changers out of the people's own institutions.

If neither major party has the power to eliminate these financial leeches from our Government-owned finance institutions, can either party complain if the mass of the American people repudiate both parties and go to the polls at the next election under a new banner? If the Democrats will render unselfish service to the American people—if they, with a golden opportunity, will only listen to petitions of the common people and make a stand with them against the selfish and money-mad money changers who have bored into Government institutions and who now exercise the power to issue money, which the Constitution reserves alone to Congress—they may expect the further support of the loyal American people. If the Democrats fail to do this, the Democratic Party will be repudiated as was the Hoover administration. The American people can see no ray of hope in turning to the Republican Party unless its leadership shows more progressive signs than it did when it refused to let the farmers in the convention at Kansas City. Mr. Speaker, let me venture this prediction: This fight to drive

the money changers out and let the people in the Government is going on until we can honestly assert that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. If neither old party is capable of leading the way, a new way will be found. You can dam up a stream, but you cannot stop its flow.

SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 125, RANGE 43, STEVENS COUNTY, MINN.

The Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank acquired title to this land by foreclosure of a mortgage given by Katherine Spooner Barrett. In 1928 the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank leased the farm to Ben Amelsberg, the lease being on file in the register of deeds' office, Stevens County, Minn.

On June 1, 1933, a new lease between Roy Nelson, receiver of the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank, and Ben Amelsberg was made covering the year 1933. Then on March 5, 1934, a new lease was made between the same parties for the 1934 season, ending October 15, 1934. Both of these leases are on file in the register of deeds office for Stevens County, Minn.

December 4, 1934, at 9 a. m. a mortgage executed by Benhart Amelsberg and wife to the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, dated August 1, 1934, against the above-described land in the amount of \$2,000 was recorded in book 70 of mortgages, on page 217, in the office of the register of deeds in and for Stevens County, Minn. This mortgage was rerecorded in book 71 of mortgages, on page 579.

On December 4, 1934, at 10 a. m. a mortgage executed by the Amelsbergs to the land-bank commissioner in the amount of \$3,400 was recorded in book 71, on page 507, which mortgage was also rerecorded in book 71 of mortgages, on page 519.

The payments provided for in the \$2,000 mortgage, running 36 years, are \$60 and \$93.05 for the final payment. In the commissioner mortgage there are 40 payments at \$85 each.

February 27, 1935, at 9 a. m. the receiver's authority to sell, dated October 27, 1934, was recorded in book 33 of deeds on page 411. This authority authorizes E. J. Friede, receiver, to sell the southwest quarter of section 12, township 125, range 43, for the sum of \$4,850. On the same day the receiver's deed was recorded in book 33 of deeds on page 412, the deed bearing date of November 2, 1934, from E. J. Friede to Bernhart Amelsberg for the sum of \$4,850, subject to the 1934 taxes. It is very evident from this record that at the time Mr. Amelsberg made application for this loan he owned no interest whatsoever in the farm; was only a tenant. The only thing he had was the agreement and authorization on the part of the Federal Land Bank Commission to the receiver of the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank to sell this farm for \$4,850, subject to the 1934 taxes, which become due in 1935.

It is also evident that a mortgage was made for considerably more than enough to pay the entire price the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank was receiving for this farm. All of which was a violation of the act of Congress authorizing the making of farm loans and certainly contrary to the policies claimed by the officials of the St. Paul Land Bank.

SOUTHEAST QUARTER AND SOUTH HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER, SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 125, RANGE 43, STEVENS COUNTY, MINN.

This land was also acquired by the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank under foreclosure of a mortgage executed by Katherine Spooner Barrett. The records in the register of deeds office, Stevens County, Minn., show that February 21, 1933, Roy Nelson, as receiver of the Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank, leased this farm to Edward H. Bahr for the period beginning February 4, 1933, and ending October 15, 1933, and that on February 2, 1934, he again leased this land to Edward H. Bahr for the year beginning February 15, 1934, and ending October 15, 1934. Both leases being on file in the office of the register of deeds.

The records further show that on June 1, 1934, at 2 p. m. a mortgage signed by Edward H. Bahr and wife, running to the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, dated June 1, 1934, in the amount of \$4,500, running for a 36-year period, with semiannual payments of \$135 and final payment of \$209.51, was recorded in book 70 of mortgages on page 129. This mortgage was rerecorded on the 18th day of August 1934 at 10 a. m. in book 70 of mortgages on page 165.

The records further show that on June 16, 1934, at 3 p. m. a mortgage running to the land-bank commissioner, executed by the same parties, dated June 1, 1934, for the sum of \$3,700, with 40 semiannual payments of \$67.61, was recorded in book 71 of mortgages, on page 320, which mortgage was re-recorded in book 71 of mortgages, on page 354, on the 18th day of August 1934.

The records further show that on the 18th day of September 1934, at 9 a. m., receivers' authority to sell the above-described land for the sum of \$7,600, subject to the 1934 taxes, dated June 30, 1934, was recorded in book 33 of deeds, on page 308, and that on the same date the receivers' deed to Edward H. Bahr, dated July 10, 1934, was recorded in book 33 of the deeds, on page 309, in the amount of \$7,600, subject to the 1934 taxes.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rules, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Colony of Connecticut, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Wednesday, May 1, 10 a. m.)

Will continue hearings on bill (H. R. 7521) pertaining to merchant marine subsidy.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

314. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 29, 1935, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination of Mokelumne River and its tributaries below Woodbridge, Calif., with a view to the control of floods, authorized by act of Congress approved January 31, 1931, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Flood Control.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7713. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1419. A bill to provide for an investigation and report of losses resulting from the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly by the Department of Agriculture; with amendment (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1776) for the relief of Herluf F. J. Ravn; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 7700) to reimburse the Soldiers Tubercular Sanitarium of Sulphur, Okla., for unauthorized emergency treatment and hospitalization of service-connected World War veterans given prior to July 1, 1930; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 7753) granting an increase of pension to Addie L. Wright; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7722) for the relief of Robert Wolfe; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 7804) authorizing the George Washington-Wakefield Memorial Bridge, Inc., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain,

and operate a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 7805) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make surveys of representative farm areas each year in each State for the purpose of obtaining and publishing information upon the economic condition of agriculture throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASSINGALE: A bill (H. R. 7806) to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAMSAY: A bill (H. R. 7807) authorizing the Brookewell Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 7808) for the relief of certain military personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE: A bill (H. R. 7809) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges across the Red River between Moorhead, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 7810) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7811) to provide for compensation for overtime services of local inspectors of steam vessels, United States shipping commissioners and their deputies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7812) to reduce the number and to increase the qualifications of supervising inspectors of vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOBBINS: A bill (H. R. 7813) to amend the Revenue Act of 1932, by imposing an excise tax on molasses not produced in continental United States, to be used for distillation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7814) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant to the State of California an easement over certain land of the United States in Tehama County, Calif., for highway purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 210) for the consideration of H. R. 6512; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AMLIE: Resolution (H. Res. 211) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information concerning the administration of the cotton crop-reduction law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1935, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DISNEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 269) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 16 to May 23, 1936, inclusive; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AMLIE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 270) authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate living and working conditions among share-tenants, share-croppers, and agricultural laborers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEAGALL: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the Banking Act of 1935; to the Committee on Printing.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, regarding the appointment of a committee to study the cotton situation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, urging Congress to reduce the Federal tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting funds to make a survey to determine the feasibility of bringing water from the north coast valleys of Molokai to the southerly side of the island for use on Hawaiian Homes Commission lands; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, urging Congress to pass an enabling act authorizing the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, supporting Senate bill 212 and House bill 2066; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting the sum of \$355,241.74 to reimburse Okaloosa County for the construction of roads and bridges within the boundaries of the Choctawhatchee National Forest; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, regarding the navigability of the Ocklawaha River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, supporting Senate bill 1220; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the inclusion of the Central Valley project in the national program of work relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, supporting the Frazier-Lemke loan-refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DALY: A bill (H. R. 7815) for the relief of Alex Taylor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 7816) for the relief of Joseph Michael Merz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 7817) granting a pension to Walter Connolly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 7818) for the relief of Caroline M. Hyde; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7819) for the relief of Walter C. Price and Joseph C. Lesage; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEE: A bill (H. R. 7820) for the relief of the United Pocahontas Coal Co., Crumpler, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 7821) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin A. Pillsbury (William J. Pillsbury, executor); to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7822) for the relief of Lucretia Norris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI: A bill (H. R. 7823) for the relief of Joseph Zebelian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7824) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to award a Distinguished Service Medal to John Moran; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 7825) for the relief of Michael Stodolnik; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 7826) granting a pension to Marion Van Natta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 7827) for the relief of Isadore Lupu; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7828) granting a pension to Nancy M. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Hattie G. Badger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 7830) for the relief of Edwin Eliason; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7831) authorizing the President to appoint Henry Beckwith Taliaferro, formerly an ensign, United States Navy, to his former rank as ensign, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 7832) granting a pension to Anna Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8012. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition headed by John Watkins, of Dunbar, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8013. Also, petition headed by Charles Lennox, of Coyle, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8014. Also, petition headed by Ollie Tuck, of Ringold, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8015. Also, petition headed by George Hopkins, of Idabel, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8016. Also, petition headed by J. I. Jarvis, of Kiowa, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8017. Also, petition headed by George Hynes, of Castle, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8018. Also, petition headed by M. B. Russell, of Altus, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8019. Also, petition headed by P. B. Burse, of Castle, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8020. Also, petition headed by John T. Blagg, of Millcreek, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8021. Also, petition headed by E. D. Roody, of Elmore City, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8022. Also, petition headed by A. R. Wilson, of Dewey, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8023. Also, petition headed by E. Washington, of Idabel, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8024. Also, petition headed by B. Nobles, of Nashoba, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the

Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8025. Also, petition headed by Gus Hankin, of Oktaha, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8026. Also, petition headed by M. B. Dykes, of Brilliant, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8027. Also, petition headed by Ollie Shull, of Cloverdale, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8028. Also, petition headed by Howard Martin, of Brookhaven, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8029. Also, petition headed by H. J. Fluke, of Langdon, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8030. Also, petition headed by G. R. Pace, of Marietta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8031. Also, petition headed by Hubert Robertson, of Conyers, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8032. Also, petition headed by L. Smith, of Conyers, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8033. Also, petition headed by Earnest Findley, of Dora, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8034. Also, petition headed by K. Hall, of East St. Louis, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8035. Also, petition headed by R. Barton, of Danville, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8036. Also, petition headed by George Higgins, of Russellville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8037. Also, petition headed by A. Marshall, of Magnolia, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8038. Also, petition headed by K. Moses, of McComb, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8039. Also, petition headed by P. Sackelford, of Wiville, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8040. Also, petition headed by Luciano Rodriguez, of Pecos, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8041. Also, petition headed by Manuel Romero, of Dixon, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8042. Also, petition headed by D. Garcia, of Chilili, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8043. Also, petition headed by N. Thomas, of Bristol, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8044. Also, petition headed by S. W. Green, of Ellenboro, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8045. Also, petition headed by Solomon Perea, of Flagstaff, Ariz., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8046. Also, petition headed by Luis Martinez, of Vallecitos, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8047. Also, petition headed by Ben Foster, of Vincent, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8048. Also, petition headed by D. Garrett, of Vincent, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8049. Also, petition headed by Willie Easton, of New Orleans, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8050. Also, petition headed by Monroe Mackey, of Formosa, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8051. Also, petition headed by Patrocinio G. Costillo, of Flagstaff, Ariz., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8052. Also, petition headed by G. R. Dutton, of Anniston, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8053. Also, petition headed by Joseph Watson, of Elva, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8054. Also, petition headed by William Mangum, of Magee, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8055. Also, petition headed by M. Ladner, of Poplarville, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8056. Also, petition headed by M. B. Bentt, of Houston, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8057. Also, petition headed by E. Smith, of Pensacola, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8058. Also, petition headed by M. M. Miller, of Fair Bluff, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8059. Also, petition headed by Edward Wiggins, of North Little Rock, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8060. Also, petition headed by G. R. Cason, of Clewiston, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8061. Also, petition headed by J. E. Lawrence, of Conroe, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8062. Also, petition headed by M. Barnett, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8063. Also, petition headed by George Mullins, of Clanton, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8064. Also, petition headed by A. E. Hayes, of Cherryville, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8065. Also, petition headed by Henry Smith, of Church Hill, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8066. Also, petition headed by W. P. Cunningham, of Northport, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8067. Also, petition headed by E. Sensley, of New Orleans, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8068. Also, petition headed by R. C. Maxey, of New Albany, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8069. Also, petition headed by Willie Walton, of Spring Hill, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8070. Also, petition headed by M. Falk, of Drewry, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8071. Also, petition headed by M. McKinney, of Whiteville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8072. Also, petition headed by Taylor Arnett, of Florence, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8073. Also, petition headed by W. R. Grissom, of Florence, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8074. Also, petition headed by J. W. Johnson, of Tamms, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8075. Also, petition headed by S. E. Curry, of Wheatcroft, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8076. Also, petition headed by Homer W. Ford, of Calvert City, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8077. Also, petition headed by C. C. Pool, of Plain Dealing, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8078. Also, petition headed by J. K. Kinney, of Wolf Lake, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8079. Also, petition headed by Willis Leek, of Melber, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the

Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8080. Also, petition headed by Will Longmire, of Indianola, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8081. Also, petition headed by M. Oliver, of Pelham, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8082. Also, petition headed by G. W. Reed, of Canton, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8083. Also, petition headed by F. Hurdle, of Vivian, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8084. Also, petition headed by A. J. Stewart, of Trinity, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8085. Also, petition headed by Dave Clark, of Arcadia, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8086. Also, petition headed by M. Davis, of Greenville, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8087. Also, petition headed by W. R. Vickery, of Greenville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8088. Also, petition headed by Rev. G. W. Stovall, of Hamilton, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8089. Also, petition headed by Sam Underwood, of Bunney, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8090. Also, petition headed by W. M. Ford, of Guild, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8091. Also, petition headed by A. Thomas, of Greenwood, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8092. Also, petition headed by Ben Days, of St. Gabriel, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8093. Also, petition headed by A. Abernathy, of Leighton, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8094. Also, petition headed by George Catlett, of Hopkinsville, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8095. Also, petition headed by John H. Jones, of Osceola, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8096. Also, petition headed by M. Thomas, of Yazoo City, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8097. Also, petition headed by E. Richardson, of Solgo-hachia, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8098. Also, petition headed by L. B. Sims, of Lake Como, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the

ERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8099. Also, petition headed by F. M. Brazzell, of Kuttawa, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8100. Also, petition headed by John H. Smith, of Danville, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8101. Also, petition headed by A. Taylor, of Mobile, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8102. Also, petition headed by C. S. Andrews, of Cincinnati, Iowa, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8103. Also, petition headed by L. U. Payne, of Alto, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8104. Also, petition headed by S. Thomas, of Louisville, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8105. Also, petition headed by Sam Woody, of Elbridge, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8106. Also, petition headed by Conrado Encinios, of Flagstaff, Ariz., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8107. Also, petition headed by Jackson Eagle, of Supply, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8108. Also, petition headed by Jackson Wirt, of Somerville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8109. Also, petition headed by D. A. Hewett, of Supply, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8110. Also, petition headed by M. N. Egger, of Sulligent, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8111. Also, petition headed by J. B. Bradley, of Ringgold, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8112. Also, petition headed by B. T. Samuel, of Keatchie, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8113. Also, petition headed by E. Davis, of Hoopeston, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8114. Also, petition headed by J. W. Stones, of Vincent, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8115. Also, petition headed by A. Kidd, of Vincent, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8116. Also, petition headed by I. Hughes, of Columbiana, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8117. Also, petition headed by R. P. Payne, of Tuckerman, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8118. Also, petition headed by Perry Crowley, of Salitpa, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8119. Also, petition headed by Ben Holbert, of Baxter Springs, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8120. Also, petition headed by L. Meredith, of Baxter Springs, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8121. Also, petition headed by N. McDonald, of Union City, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8122. Also, petition headed by J. J. Crow, of Oxford, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8123. Also, petition headed by Edwin George Smith, of North Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8124. Also, petition headed by M. E. Price, of Rochelle, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8125. Also, petition headed by A. D. Guillotte, of Rochelle, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8126. Also, petition headed by P. Thompson, of Winfield, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8127. Also, petition headed by William Johnson, of Miccosukee, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8128. Also, petition headed by J. V. Whitlock, of Commerce, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8129. Also, petition headed by Octave Morris, of New Orleans, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8130. Also, petition headed by M. J. Walker, of Jacksonville, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8131. Also, petition headed by R. E. Hearn, of Winchester, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8132. Also, petition headed by H. C. Gregg, of Samantha, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8133. Also, petition headed by W. M. Arnold, of Sylacauga, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8134. Also, petition headed by Joseph Harris, of Waldo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8135. Also, petition headed by Grant White, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

ERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8136. Also, petition headed by S. J. Etheredge, of Town Creek, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8137. Also, petition headed by O. Prestley, of Asheville, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8138. Also, petition headed by C. C. Calloway, of Waverly, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8139. Also, petition headed by William Young, of Tenaha, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8140. Also, petition headed by N. Babcock, of Ottawa, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8141. Also, petition headed by M. Rickman, of Selmer, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8142. Also, petition headed by R. Green, of North Little Rock, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8143. Also, petition headed by Andy R. Bishop, of Phil Campbell, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8144. Also, petition headed by John Harris, of Snow Lake, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8145. Also, petition headed by Henry Hohnson, of Glenwood, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8146. Also, petition headed by J. J. Stancil, of Altoona, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8147. Also, petition headed by Harmon Smith, of Peach Orchard, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8148. Also, petition headed by E. Davis, of Caryville, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8149. Also, petition headed by Bill Jones, of Columbia, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8150. Also, petition headed by B. B. Burge, of Mayfield, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8151. Also, petition headed by George Barber, of Mansfield, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8152. Also, petition headed by Butch Ward, of DeKalb, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8153. Also, petition headed by Clarence Turner, of Billingsley, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8154. Also, petition headed by J. D. Baker, of Nacogdoches, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8155. Also, petition headed by Charley White, of Marinoguin, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8156. Also petition headed by D. Rush, of Jasper, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8157. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition of the German Methodist Episcopal Church, Lawrence, Mass., urging repeal of the cotton-processing tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8158. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of 783 members of the Erie County Farm Bureau, Buffalo, N. Y., urging favorable consideration of the Goldsborough amendment to the Banking Act of 1935; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8159. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution, unanimously adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers of New York City, urging that a joint commission be appointed by Congress to investigate oriental competition and its effect upon American industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8160. Also, resolution, adopted at the regular meeting of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, representing 40,000 organized printing-trades workers in New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 7442, to prevent inferior substitute printing processes and to enlarge the field of employment, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8161. By Mr. CARTER of California: Memorial of the State of California, Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, petitioning the President and the Congress to include the Central Valley project in the national program of work relief; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

8162. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of the Senate Legislative Department, State of California, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, by Senator McGovern; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8163. By Mr. FOCHT: Resolution of silk and rayon manufacturers, to extend the functions of the Cabinet committee appointed to study the cotton-textile industry to include a similar study of the problems existing in the silk- and rayon-textile industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8164. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of John O. Chumney, of Irene, and Clyde Tomlinson, secretary of Smith & Tomlinson, Hillsboro, Tex., opposing the Wagner labor bill (S. 1958); to the Committee on Labor.

8165. Also, petition of George A. Adams, of Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 6452; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8166. By Mr. KING: Petition of the Eighteenth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing Congress to provide funds for making a survey to determine the feasibility of bringing water from the north coast valleys of Molokai to the southerly side of the island for use on Hawaiian Homes Commission lands; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8167. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Willmar, Minn., urging repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8168. Also, petition of the Kiwanis Club of Morris, Minn., urging repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8169. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of St. Joseph's Lodge, No. 1, S. C. U., Calumet, Mich., urging continuation of tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8170. Also, petition of the United Action Committee, composed of 21 Czech and Slovak Societies of Detroit, Mich., urging the support of the Lundeen workers' unemployment

old-age and social-insurance bill (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

8171. Also, resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Gogebic Range Post, No. 1823, Ironwood, Mich., petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to build a Veterans' Administration hospital of 500-bed capacity in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8172. Also, resolution of Joint Council of Women's Auxiliaries, organization composed of women relatives of members of the trade unions in St. Louis, Mo., urging support of the Wagner-Connery labor relations bill and also the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8173. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of the Customs Tailoring Workers' Independent Union of New York, condemning the proposed sedition laws of the McCormack-Dickstein congressional committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8174. Also, resolution passed by the Executive Council of the United States Cavalry Association, protesting against proposed legislation for Air Corps officers, before the Military Affairs Committee, as being unjust to officers of other arms and services, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8175. Also, resolution of the members of the board of the National Federation of Textiles, Inc., respectfully requesting that the President of the United States extend the functions of the Cabinet committee appointed to study the cotton-textile industry to include a similar study of the problems existing in the silk- and rayon-textile industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8176. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition of Ossining Aerie, No. 1545, Fraternal Order of Eagles, supporting the social-security bill (S. 1130); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8177. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, concerning the Gray bill (H. R. 7442); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8178. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, concerning Senate bill 1629, providing for the regulation of transportation by motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8179. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of the Gogebic Range Post, No. 1823, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Ironwood, Mich., signed by Joseph Ebli, commander, and Leo Vigue, adjutant, petitioning the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to authorize and appropriate sufficient money to build a Veterans' Administration hospital of 500-bed capacity in or near Detroit; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8180. Also, resolution of St. Joseph's Lodge, No. 1, S. C. U., a fraternal society composed of copper miners, signed by John Somrack, president, Peter Pasich, secretary, and John Ilenick, treasurer, favoring the enactment of such legislation as will effectively prohibit the importation of foreign copper in the future; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8181. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council of the City of Lowell, Mass., urging the elimination of the processing tax on textiles; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8182. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, concerning House bill 7442, introduced by Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8183. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, concerning Senate bill 1629, for the regulation of transportation by motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8184. Also, petition of the Transport Workers Union, New York City, concerning the Lundeen bill (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

8185. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the United Action Committee, composed of 21 Czech and Slovak societies of Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 2827; to the Committee on Labor.

8186. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition signed by Chairman P. Dunlay, of the United Spanish War Veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

8187. Also, petition of the State of Connecticut, regarding United States Veterans' Hospital at Newington; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8188. By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, urging Congress to appropriate the necessary funds for the completion of veterans' hospital at Newington; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8189. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions adopted by Celtic Social Club, of Holyoke, Mass., urging the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp in honor of Commodore Barry and the designation of Barry Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8190. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of the Toledo Typographical Union, of Toledo, Ohio, by their secretary, Roy G. Woolford, requesting the support of House bill 7172, known as the "Mead substitute bill", and also the support of House bill 6990, which provides for a 40-hour week for all postal employees; to the Committee on Labor.

8191. Also, petition of the Toledo Typographical Union, of Toledo, Ohio, by their secretary, Roy G. Woolford, requesting the support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8192. Also, petition of the Joint Council of Women's Auxiliaries of St. Louis, Mo., by their secretary, Mrs. R. E. McClanahan, requesting support of the Wagner-Connery labor-relations bill and the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8193. Also, petition of David H. March and numerous other citizens of Beverly Hills, Calif., requesting favorable action on House bill 6628, to provide employment for the blind; to the Committee on Labor.

8194. Also, petition of the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters, Local No. 268, of St. Louis, Mo., by their secretary, G. A. Richards, requesting the passage of the Wagner-Connery labor-relations bill and the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill, because they feel sure if these bills are passed they will be a great help in securing employment; to the Committee on Labor.

8195. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Columbia Lodge, No. 85, I. B. P. O. E. W.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Apr. 15, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar days Monday, April 29, and Tuesday, April 30, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Capper	Gore	McKellar
Ashurst	Caraway	Guffey	McNary
Austin	Carey	Hale	Minton
Bachman	Clark	Harrison	Moore
Bailey	Connally	Hastings	Murphy
Bankhead	Coolidge	Hatch	Murray
Barbour	Copeland	Hayden	Neely
Barkley	Costigan	Johnson	Norris
Bilbo	Couzens	Keyes	Nye
Black	Dickinson	King	O'Mahoney
Bone	Dieterich	La Follette	Overton
Borah	Donahay	Lewis	Pittman
Brown	Duffy	Logan	Pope
Bulkley	Fletcher	Loneragan	Radcliffe
Bulow	Frazier	Long	Robinson
Burke	Gerry	McAdoo	Russell
Byrd	Gibson	McCarran	Schall
Byrnes	Glass	McGill	Schwellenbach